

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XL

JUNE, 1925

NUMBER 6

CHAUCER AND THE CHURCH

For years Chaucer's religious views have interested students of the poet. In 1916 appeared a particularly important paper on *Chaucer and Wyclif*¹ by Professor Tatlock in which is shown that the poet in his attitude toward the church often reflects contemporary opinion. Though Tatlock finds it impossible to state definitely Chaucer's views, he does come to the following conclusion: "Toward the church he was critical, though not unusually so, and he was probably not unsympathetic to the concrete criticism directed at her by other vigorous and earnest souls of his day. We have no reason to doubt that he went to mass on Sundays and holy days, and to confession and communion at least once a year; and that at the hour of death he would have been disturbed if he had missed absolution, unction and viaticum" (p. 76). Recently Professor Maxfield has produced fresh evidence indicating that religious thought was not static in the last quarter of the fourteenth century;² that really "Wyclif himself passed through a progressive series of views" (p. 67); that the reformer was not, as sometimes thought, a radical but a conservative—"in favor of cutting back to medieval simplicity and purity" (p. 68). Upon the question of Chaucer's personal religion, however, Maxfield merely states that "we shall probably never know" (p. 74).

In previous discussions a valuable document has been overlooked, one that will not only throw light on religious reform but on the poet's relation to the church as well. Moreover, since the document reflects public opinion between 1387 and 1390, its contents become

¹ *Mod. Phil.*, XIV (1916), 65-76.

² *P. M. L. A.*, XXXIX (1924), 64-74. G. C. Coulton (*Social Life in Britain*, 197, 249) also warns against assuming that the M. Ages were uniform.

doubly important in any discussion of the religious beliefs of the author of the *Canterbury Tales*.

The document is as follows: "Letter of the king to the pope, reciting that former ³ kings, princes and faithful men of the realm did build and endow churches, and set therein spiritual husbandmen who tilled the Lord's field, that the seed fell upon good land, yielding some thirtyfold, some sixtyfold, and some an hundredfold, but that in these days putting their hand to the plow they have begun to look back, and the land bears thorns and nettles, while by imposts, provisions and reservations general and special made by the papal see, not for appointment of fit shepherds but to heap up first fruits and rob the realm of treasure, false shepherds and hirelings are entering the fold, Christ's sheep are a prey of wolves, the pious alms of the kings etc. aforesaid pass to the pleasures of the unworthy, freedom of election to cathedral churches and elective dignities great and small, collation whereto at every vacancy pertained to former kings, who at the instance of the papal see granted free election by chapters provided they should first crave license of the king to elect and his assent afterwards, which grant was by the papal see confirmed, is now of little or no effect, that if one cathedral church be void five or six bishops are translated in order that he who leaps highest may pay most abundantly and Caesar's image be brought into the house of God, that the abuse of provision and reservation has gone so far that dignities and the fattest benefices with and without cures are conferred upon aliens, sometimes upon enemies, who reside not nor may reside therein, understanding not the tongue and knowing not their sheep nor by them known, that sometimes dwellers in the realm do enter upon offices of the church contrary to the canons, not having their vocation of God like Aaron but inflamed with ambition with Simon Magus, and that men of letters manifestly fitted for the cure of souls and to profit the king and realm by their counsel public and private, having no hope of advancement, abandon their studies at the universities, the number of the clergy is diminishing, and learning is dying out,⁴ that former kings made statutes, that the election should be freely made as aforesaid, that alien persons who would

³ On the statute of 1351 see Oman, *Polit. Hist. of England*, iv (1906), 120; also Tout, *ibid.*, III (1905), 377. Cf. *infra*.

⁴ For the parson in the GP cf. *infra*. Also the clerk in GP may be compared.

not or might not reside within the realm should not be admitted to benefices, and ecclesiastical persons having the right of patronage should use the same according to such ordinance, adding penalties to be executed upon such as should rebel, notwithstanding which the grievance has increased, wherefore in the parliament last holden at London ⁵ grievous complaint was made by the lords and commons requiring the king, in accordance with the oath taken at his coronation that he should preserve the rights of the crown and the liberties of the realm and church, to cause the said statutes to be observed, and praying the pope as successor as of the chief of the apostles, who took upon him the command of Christ to feed his sheep and not to shear them, to comfort his brethren and not to oppress them, pondering the premises and the devotion and obedience of the royal house, the clergy and the people of the realm, to do away the scandals and perils above rehearsed, so that the king and his people, being desirous to reverence the person of the pope and the church of Rome, may have rest from these burdens not to be borne which oppress the shoulders of his children and may enjoy their ancient liberty. Sealed with the privy seal, and with the seals of John duke of Aquitaine and Lancastre, Edmund duke of York, Thomas duke of Gloucestre, Edward duke of Rutland, Roger earl of March, Thomas earl of Kent, John earl of Huntington, Richard earl of Arundell, Thomas earl of Warrewyk, Thomas earl of Stafford, William earl of Salisbury,⁶ Thomas earl of Notyngham marshal of England, Henry earl of Northumberland, John lord Roos, Ralph lord Neville,⁷ Thomas lord Clifford, John lord Lovell, John lord Cobeham, John lord Beaumont barons, John Devereux steward of the household, Thomas de Percy under chamberlain, Richard Lescrope, Henry de Percy, William de Beauchamp, Lewis de Clifford, Edward Dalyngrugge, Richard Stury and Richard Adderbury ⁸ knights. Dated Westminster palace, 26 May, 13 Richard II (1390).⁹

⁵ *I. e.*, Jan. 17 to Mar. 2, 1389/90 (cf. Oman, *op. cit.*, 119).

⁶ On his connections with Barking see "Notes on Chaucer's Prioress," *Philol. Quart.*, II (1923), 302 ff.

⁷ Brother of the Archb. of York (see *infra*) condemned in 1388 (cf. *Scot. Hist. Review*, XI, 78).

⁸ Chamberlain of the queen. Scrope Chaucer knew of because of the S.-Grosvenour controversy.

⁹ *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1389-92, 140 f. The original appears in the *Foedera*

This remonstrance, in other words, is against the lack of "spiritual husbandmen." No official of the church escapes censure,—from the lowest to the bishops. So corrupt are conditions that even when a cathedral church becomes vacant five or six bishops are transferred. Simony as a result is widely practiced. Universities, moreover, are suffering, and as a consequence learning is dying out.¹⁰ In view of this alarming situation the Council prays the pope to "feed his sheep and not to shear them,"¹¹ and give "comfort to his brethren in England and not to oppress them."¹² That this was not simply an official attitude toward the church in 1390 is clear: the Council is merely echoing public sentiment as strongly voiced by the lords and commons at Parliament a few weeks before.¹³

Where did Chaucer stand? The sympathetic portrayal of the Parson as well as the exposure of the regulars implies that he, too, was chiefly concerned with the essence of religion. Naturally, though the point has never been stressed,¹⁴ on this matter, Chaucer would be in essential agreement with the state. It is unthinkable that one with his close court connections should hold very radical beliefs.¹⁵ His prosperity was dependent upon harmony between church and state. Richard's return to power in 1389 meant not only a thwarted Gloucester, but Rome as well.¹⁶ But with Richard's supremacy Chaucer also came out of obscurity. Nor was this unusual: throughout his life the poet's welfare was linked with the crown. Furthermore, his known intimacy with some of the signers of the appeal to Rome (to be discussed presently)—who had also dropped out of sight from 1386 to 1389—arrests attention. Ac-

(Rymer, VII, 672 ff.). The prelates, including Skirlawe, did not sign the petition. (For names of members see *Proc. Privy Council*, ed. Nicolas, I.)

¹⁰ Richard Ronhale, formerly master of "Soler Hall" (cf. *Reve's Tale*), may have been one of the worldly type. He was a clerk in Skirlawe's "room"—in chancery. I hope soon to publish more facts about him.

¹¹ This is a conventional touch found in earlier petitions (cf. Hughes, *Illustrations of Chaucer's England*, 1918, 190). Professor F. Tupper very kindly called my attention to this reference.

¹² On the political aspect of the quarrel with Rome see *infra*.

¹³ It was at the latter part of the meeting of Parl. that this, the most important legislation (cf. Oman, *infra*), was discussed.

¹⁴ Cf., however, Cox, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxvi (1921), 477, 481.

¹⁵ Cf. Tatlock, 73.

¹⁶ On Wyclif and Gaunt see A.-Smith's life of the latter (chap. VIII).

cordingly, there is no reason to think that Geoffrey Chaucer's views on the church differed greatly from those of his intimate acquaintances and his King—especially at a time when one's religion was not dissociated from one's political connections.

Some outstanding facts support this view. In the letter to the Pope complaint was made that "election by chapters . . . is now of little or no effect," and that with a vacancy of a bishopric there is a mad race "in order that he who leaps highest may pay most abundantly." Did the Council have in mind any one offender? Is it possible to single out a particular bishop in an age of ecclesiastical abuses? Seemingly it is. It so happens that there was one notorious case just at this time; a person, moreover, well known in London. Too, this prelate was a native of—as well as prominent in—the community where the poet set the scene dealing with the corruption of the church. It is none other than Master Walter Skirlawe—archdeacon for years of Holderness.

Some facts concerning this ecclesiast were given in *Chaucer's Bukton*.¹⁷ It was there shown that both Skirlawe and Bukton came from the same district (Holderness) and that the former was archdeacon of that region as early as 1359, a position he was still holding until the beginning of 1386;¹⁸ that he not only held various ecclesiastical appointments simultaneously, but was likewise a prominent official in the king's court. Other biographical data may now be given.

In 1359 he received a benefice in Durham, but was to resign his church in (Preston) Bucks.¹⁹ While archdeacon of Holderness he became canon in Howden, York (1362),²⁰ and in 1370 was given another prebend in the same shire.²¹ Though still archdeacon, by 1381 he held the similar office in Northampton.²² The same year

¹⁷ *P. M. L. A.*, xxxviii (1923), 123 f. His life in *D. N. B.* is meager; Wylie (*Hist. of Henry IV*, II, 481 ff.) is better.

¹⁸ Jan. 6 he is called "late archdeacon of East Riding" (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1385-9, 96). Feb. 8 the place is given to Wm. de Waltham (*ibid.*, 114). I am unable to learn to which party W. belonged. Hermesthorp had held it in 1363-4 (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1361-4, 473).

¹⁹ *Cal. Papal Regs. Papal Letters*, III, 1342-1362, 604. Bucks was Vache's shire.

²⁰ *Cal. Papal Regs., Petitions*, I, 393.

²¹ Le Neve, III, 184. In 1359 he had been secretary of the Archb. of York (*Cal. Papal Regs., Petitions*, I, 349).

²² *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1377-81, 623. Le Neve (II, 89; cf. 57) states that he exchanged this for a prebend in St. Martin's-le-Grand in 1383-4.

he became treasurer of Lincoln.²³ In addition to these various offices, he was dean of St. Martin's le Grand (London) from 1376 to 1384.²⁴ Meanwhile (1381) he, as well as Sir Nicholas Dagsworth and Sir John Hawkwood (the latter a friend of Chaucer),²⁵ was sent on a mission to the holy see.²⁶

That he was living in London during these years (except when abroad) is evident. The will of Edward III was witnessed by him and men in Chaucer's circle.²⁷ He had been a clerk in the old king's chancery,²⁸ and was retained by Richard.²⁹ From 1382 to 1385 he was keeper of the privy seal.³⁰ Repeatedly he served on commissions in the metropolis: for instance in connection with the dispute over the staple ports (alluded to in General Prologue) in 1389 and 1390,³¹ and 1391.³² Others (in Chaucer's circle) who served were Richard Stury, the Earl of Salisbury, and Richard Ronhale, one-time master of "Soler Hall" (Cambridge).³³

Additional proof of his London residence (in a document that

²³ Le Neve, II, 89.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 371, 619; *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1381-5, 281. [His successor was John Bacun, another royal clerk (*ibid.*, 375; cf. 281).]

²⁵ Cf. *Life Records*, Nos. 121, 122, pp. 216-219. Hawkwood, the "famous English free-lance," had married one of Bernabo Visconti's daughters. On Bernabo see *Monk's Tale* and Kittredge, "Date of Chaucer's Troilus" (*Chaucer Soc.*, 1909, 48 n.). Chaucer in 1378 had been sent to Lombardy to interview Hawkwood.

²⁶ Rymer, VII, 298, 307, 353, 354.

²⁷ *Test. Vet.*, I, 12. Other witnesses were: the "trusty and beloved" John Burley (fellow ambassador with Chaucer); John de Beverley and John de Salisbury (fellow members of the poet in the king's household); and Chaucer's friends, Vache and Stury.

²⁸ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1377-81, 32, 232; cf. 260.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 232.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 1381-5, 197; cf. 261, 509, 584, 587. See Foss, *Judges*, 1870, 615 f. It is interesting to note that his "servant" was made comptroller (for life) of the customs at Hull (Holderness) in Oct., 1382—five months after Chaucer received the office of Petty Customs (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1381-5, 212). On Hull see Gen. Prol., 404.

³¹ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1388-92, 173 f., 196. London merchants complained that soldiers at the instigation of Roger de Walden, treasurer of Calais, set upon their ships. Walden, one may note, became dean of St. Martin's the following year, a position formerly held by Skirlawe, and given to Ronhale in 1390.

³² *Ibid.*, 372, 374.

³³ On Ronhale see *supra*.

also illustrates the workings of the church and government of the time) is the following. In 1383 a committee was appointed to audit the account of John Bacun, king's clerk. Those who served were Skirlawe, keeper of the seal, Hugh Segrave, treasurer, Simon Burley, under-chamberlain, Richard Adderbury, chamberlain of the queen, and the barons of the Exchequer.³⁴ Now one of the chamberlains of the Exchequer was John Hermesthorp—arch-deacon of Holderness in 1363 and 1370,³⁵ who succeeded Skirlawe as dean of St. Martin's! No wonder Langland could write:

Bischopes and bachelers bothe maistres and doctours,

Liggen in London in lenten, an elles.

Some seruen þe kyng and his siluer tellen,

In cheker and in chancerye (B. 87 ff.).³⁷

Skirlawe's frequent missions abroad likewise indicate that his ecclesiastical duties (in the north) were performed *in absentia*. No prelate in his day was sent so often to the continent as ambassador.³⁸ Strangely enough he seems to have gone for the first time—as did Chaucer—to France in 1377.³⁹ Equally interesting is the fact that he went at about the same time (the commission is dated two days before), and for the same purpose.⁴⁰ The following year he was in France,⁴¹ as well as twice in 1379⁴² and 1379-80.⁴³ In 1380 he was on two other missions also: in Scotland (with Gaunt) and France.⁴⁴ To France in 1381,⁴⁵ and Germany,

³⁴ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1381-5, 291, 335.

³⁵ Cf. n. 18.

³⁷ These lines (from 87-204) are not in A. Plurality is condemned in the "Complaint of the Plowman" (*Pol. Poems*, I, 325).

³⁸ Miss Rickert believes that "lawyers were commonly employed on diplomatic missions . . . to do the work" (*Manly Anniv. Studies in Lang. and Lit.*, 1923, 30). Skirlawe had studied canon and civil law (*Papal Letters, Petitions*, I, 1342-1419, 345, 349). Capes (*The English Church in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries*, 1900, 240) notes that archdeacons received special training, usually in Italian law schools.

³⁹ Rymer, III, Pt. III, 58; *Life-Records*, 204 n. *Passim*, Bloomfield, *Norfolk*, VI, 385.

⁴⁰ *Life-Records*, 204 n.

⁴¹ Rymer, 73, 75; *Bibl. l'ecole des chartres*, LX, 198.

⁴² Rymer, 88, 90; *Bibl.*, etc., 201 (*bis*).

⁴³ Rymer, 97; *Bibl.*, etc., 201 f.

⁴⁴ *Bibl.*, 202 (*bis*).

⁴⁵ *Bibl.*, 203.

Bohemia and Rome in 1381-2;⁴⁶ to France in 1383-4 (with Gaunt);⁴⁷ to France in 1384,⁴⁸ 1385,⁴⁹ 1386,⁵⁰ 1388 (with Clanvowe),⁵¹ 1389,⁵² and 1390.⁵³ To Scotland and France in 1392;⁵⁴ France in 1393;⁵⁵ Scotland in 1394;⁵⁶ and, finally to France in 1399, 1400, and 1401.⁵⁷

Though there is, up to this point, no particular reason for thinking that his career was necessarily unusual, two other incidents hint at a connection between him and the appeal to Rome. In 1385 and 1386 there were made two appointments to fill vacant bishoprics that strained the relations between Richard and his Holiness. In each case, moreover, the bishop involved was Skirlawe. By a papal bull of July, 1385 he became bishop of Coventry and Lichfield.⁵⁸ Before he could be enthroned, however, the pope transferred him to Bath and Wells, which had become vacant in July (1386).⁵⁹ This had taken place (18 August) in spite of the fact that the king's favorite, Richard Medford, had been the choice of the chapter.⁶⁰ That the reference in the petition of 1390 to "free election by chapters" can refer to the Bath and Wells episode is therefore possible.

The happenings a few months later sustain this belief. On the very day that the Lords Appellant came into power (April 3, 1388) Skirlawe—who had become this year a member of the king's Council⁶¹—was transferred by the pope to the powerful see of

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 204; Rymer, 119.

⁴⁷ Rymer, 160, 162; Higden, ix, 24; *Bibl.*, 206 (*bis*).

⁴⁸ *Bibl.*, 206.

⁴⁹ *Bibl.*, 207 (*bis*). Apparently with Clanvowe.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 208.

⁵¹ Rymer, III, Pt. IV, 34 f.; cf. 44, 46.

⁵² Rymer, 49; Higden, ix, 218; Wals. (*Hist. Angl.*), II, 179. Clanvowe and Dagsworth (cf. n. 25) were the others.

⁵³ Rymer, 56 f. Others were Stury, Devereux and Ronhale.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 78, 80; cf. 100.

⁵⁵ *Bibl.*, 211.

⁵⁶ Rymer, 102.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 170, 178, 200; cf. 183; also, *ibid.*, IV, Pt. I, 3, 7, 13; *Hist. Angl.* (*op. cit.*), II, 242.

⁵⁸ *Cal. Pat. Rolls* 1385-9, 37; Le Neve (I, 551) gives June 28. Wykeham, it may be mentioned, was an arch-pluralist also (cf. *D. N. B.*).

⁵⁹ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 240-2; cf. 245. He held in 1386 the prebend of Milton in Lincoln (Le Neve, II, 187).

⁶⁰ Le Neve, I, 139. Richard assented to his election 15 Aug. (1386).

⁶¹ Cf. *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1385-9, 502.

Durham.⁶² Yet this place was not empty, for Richard's friend, John Fordham, still held it, though he was on that same day removed to the smaller see of Ely.⁶³ It is evident, therefore, that Skirlawe was not only the powerful ally of the Gloucester faction but of the pope as well. The stinging papal and political rebuke is manifest; it is only too obvious that both parties were conspiring in Richard's downfall.⁶⁴

⁶² Cf. *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1385-9, 504, etc. Arundell became Archb. of York on 3 April also; and on same day John de Waltham became b. of Salisbury, and was consecrated at Cambridge the following Sept.

⁶³ Le Neve, III, 291. Fordham did his fealty to Richard and made his profession of obedience in Barnwell church at Cambridge in Sept. (1388) (cf. Le Neve, I, 337).

A few facts concerning Durham are worthy of mention. The bishops of D. within their bishopric enjoyed all rights and privileges which the king had in his kingdom. "In D., said a lawyer of the fourteenth century, the Bishop may do as he will, for he is king there" (cf. G. T. Lapsley, "The County Palatine of Durham," *Harvard Historical Studies*, VIII, 1900, 30). He was head of the civil government of the palatinate, and even the prior of D. had his own court "and, up to a certain point, almost exclusive jurisdiction over his men" (*ibid.*, 34). The bishop's household in the Middle Ages was immense, and in the fifteenth century was probably larger than that of an earl, which averaged 130 persons. One of Skirlawe's predecessors had a retinue of 140 knights (*ibid.*, 99 ff.). The bishop had power to appoint his justices of peace (*ibid.*, 178 f.); he had his mintage system (*ibid.*, 280). His income was enormous. Bishop Hatfield in 1369 was robbed of £2500 from his castle, and the only account is the pardon of the robbery in 1385 (*ibid.*, 293 f.). Friars never got a foothold in D., nor were they ever allowed to preach there (*ibid.*, 50). However, Skirlawe remembers them in his will (*Test. Ebor.*, I, 308). *Passim*, "Roll of Skirlawe, Bishop of D. from 1388-1405" in the *33rd Annual Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records*. London, 1872, 43-85.

⁶⁴ Other facts in the life of Skirlawe may be given. The date of his birth is unknown, though since he asked to be excused in 1397 (on account of "great age") from attending Parliament (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1396-9, 221), he was probably born between 1330 and 1340. He may have been of humble origin (cf. *D. N. B.*). He went to Oxford (Durham House) where he studied canon and civil law for six years (*Papal Regs., Petitions*, I, 1342-1419, 245, 349).

He was naturally a man of means. In 1383 while living in the parish of "St. Clement Danes without Temple Bar," thieves robbed him of silver vessels valued at 600 marks (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1381-5, 212, 322, 495; cf. 1388-1392, 429). At this time he was lodging at the "inn" of the Bishop of Bath, whom he was to succeed in three years. In the autumn of 1386

What took place immediately after Richard's return (May 3, 1389) amply supports such inferences. One of the King's first acts was to recall Gaunt from Spain. "Preparations for the Duke's return began in August; but delay only increased the King's impatience, and on October 30 a formal summons to return either by sea or land was despatched to the Duke at Bordeaux. A courier reported to the Privy Council that weighty matters touching the custody of Aquitaine had prevented the Duke from returning as he had hoped to do at the beginning of November. As it was, he

when Richard acknowledged debts, Skirlawe was among those who had lent money (£100). Others of interest to students of Chaucer are: the abess of Barking (£40); abbot of Osney (£50); prior of St. Frideswide (£20) (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1385-9, 227 f.). In 1385 he, Simon Burley and others acquired the castle of Hingham and numerous manors in Essex (*ibid.*, 1381-5, 556 f.); in 1386 at Aylesbury (Bucks) (*ibid.*, 1385-9, 163); in 1391 lands in York (*ibid.*, 1388-92, 431); the manor of Nottingham with others in 1392 (*ibid.*, 1391-6, 57); and, with others, a manor in the city of York in 1397 (*ibid.*, 334).

He was also a man of learning. He wrote a commentary on the Aristotelian treatise of Growth and Decay (*De Generatione & Corruptione*) (A. Wood, *Historia . . . Oxoniensis*, Oxford, 1674, II, 57 f.), a work prescribed for the arts course at Oxford (Ayliffe, *The Ancient and Present State of the University of Oxford*, London, 1723, I, 252). He gave the University many books including his work (for list see *Test. Ebor.*, I, 323 f.; cf. *Munimenta Academica*, ed. Henry Anstey, *Rolls Series*, 34). As a benefactor his name endured. As late as the time of Philip and Mary the form of prayer used in the chapel of University College on the day of the yearly College Festival begins thus: "Merciful God and loving Father, we give Thee humble and hearty thanks for Thy great Bounty bestow'd upon us of this place by Alfred the Great, the first Founder of this House; William of Durham the Restorer of it; Walter Skirlaw, Henry Percy . . . especial Benefactors" (A. Clarke, *Colleges of Oxford*, London, 1891, 1 f.). The basis for this prayer was the founding in 1404 of three fellowships in the University (*Test. Ebor.*, I, 306 f.; Wylie, II, 482. Chaucer's clerk, though doubtless worthy, had no fellowship: cf. Jones, *P. M. L. A.*, XXVII, 107 ff.). Each fellow is to have 40s. yearly, and he shall pray for the king and bishop. On the day of the bishop's death the fellows yearly shall celebrate with *placebo* and *dirigo*, and shall receive 6s. 8d., and the like amount on the day of St. Cuthbert. The fellows are to attend Oxford or Cambridge, and preferably from the dioceses of York and Durham (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1401-5, 377).

He died in 1404 at Howden, the manorial seat of the Bishop of Durham (*Test. Ebor.*, I, 317; cf. *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1405-8, 166), and left a remarkable will. His bequests (to all classes of people) in money were enormous, even

proposed to come back at the beginning of February; if, however, the King required his presence earlier he would obey forthwith, but to guard himself against suspicion and the malice of enemies he requested formal sanction for travelling if necessary overland.

But Richard, fearing some act of violence from Gloucester, refused to wait until February; and on November 19, 1389, John of Gaunt landed at Plymouth."⁶⁵

Exactly three weeks later (Dec. 10) a meeting of the King's Council was held at Reading. "As Lancaster rode thither he was met two miles from the town by the King. Three years and their bitter experiences had worked a change in Richard's estimate of parties and their leaders: the man whose departure in 1386 he had welcomed with ill-concealed satisfaction is now hailed as a deliverer. . . . To the King and to each of his suite John of Gaunt gave the kiss of peace, declaring the old quarrels forgotten."⁶⁶

In the meantime (Dec. 6)—seventeen days after Gaunt landed—Parliament was summoned; it sat from Jan. 17 to March 2.⁶⁷ The most important legislation, says Oman, was the abuse of papal

in terms of today. To a thousand poor people he gave 13s. 4d. each with which to buy beds and other necessities (*Test. Ebor.*, I, 313; equivalent today to c. \$60,000). He generously remembered the friars, including the Carmelites, brothers Stephen Patrington and Robert Selby (*ibid.*, 313 f.). He built bridges, gates, dormitories, cloisters (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1391-6, 539 f., 581 f.; cf. 553, 555). In 1394-5 he was permitted to found a chantry in Howden, at the altar of St. Cuthbert (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1391-6, 57). He gave immense sums towards the building of the central tower at York, and repaired various churches. In money alone his bequests amounted to c. a quarter of a million dollars.

The will, covering nearly twenty pages, mentions stores of ecclesiastical garments, many of which (like the Monk's) were purfled with grys; costly vessels of silver and gold,—all of which exhibit the splendor of the see of Durham. He was buried in Durham Cathedral. "The slab, if it now remains, is covered with pews" (*Test. Ebor.*, I, 307 n.).

The following delightful bit may be given. One of his retainers testified at a Lollard suit (in 1401) that S. was a "bit testy." (This was the only time, as far as known, that he attempted to suppress the Lollards; cf. Wylie, II, 482). His autograph is in J. G. Nichols, *Autographs of Royal and Noble Personages*, 10 c.

⁶⁵ S. Armitage-Smith, 340.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 341. Because of his satisfaction with the Duke, Richard, at the end of the session of Parliament (March, 1390), made John Duke of Guienne (Oman, 120).

⁶⁷ *Rot. Parl.*, III, 257-276.

provisions. "The statute of 1351 against those who obtained from Rome the grant or reservation of a benefice or an office, to the detriment of the rightful patron, was re-enacted. Stringent penalties were attached; commoners might be punished for treason; prelates were subject to exile or loss of their temporalities."⁶⁸ That the petition to the papal court a few weeks later (May 26) could refer to the "grievous complaint . . . by the lords and commons requiring the king . . . that he should preserve the rights of the crown and the liberties of the realm and the church" was within the bounds of truth. Meanwhile, the important thing to remember is that public feeling in the early months of 1389 was unanimous in its attitude toward papal abuses: evils that culminated with Richard's overthrow in 1386, at the very time when Skirlawe played a leading part.

Among the members of the King's Council in 1389 was at least one intimate of Chaucer,—Sir Lewis Clifford. Since he, as well as some others of the Council, is usually termed a Lollard, further discussion becomes necessary. How can we reconcile the religious convictions of these men with the fact that they were confidants of the King? Would the latter have had about him—at this critical moment—men so heretical that his very purpose would have been defeated? If ever he needed support (witness the warmth of language in the proceedings of Parliament)—and tactful diplomats—it was at this time. Surely he knew what he was about when he picked his body of advisers.⁶⁹

Now these knights, as has been shown,⁷⁰ could not have been as heretical as generally thought. That the chroniclers were hostile witnesses is obvious: the strongholds of monasticism were naturally on the defensive, only too eager to give aid to the church. That these three knights, in short, were much more liberal (c. 1390) in their religious views than the court is highly improbable. The age, as said, demanded not religious thought so much as political unity: to this the pages of the *Rolls of Parliament* bear eloquent testimony. And the facts in the lives of these three men support this view.

⁶⁸ Oman, 119.

⁶⁹ To be sure a spirit of compromise existed. But in choosing knights for his Council the case seems different. Moreover, Clifford was a member of Gaunt's household. Queen Anne was sympathetic with liberal thinkers (cf. Deanesley, *The Lollard Bible*, 1920, 278).

⁷⁰ Waugh, *Scot. Hist. Rev.*, XI (1914), 55 ff.

Clifford was a famous man, equally well known in France and England.⁷¹ From youth he had been intimately associated with Gaunt.⁷² He was likewise a follower of Richard from the accession (1377). Like Chaucer, therefore, he was on intimate terms with both the Duke and his nephew. He too dropped out of sight in 1386, only to return three years later as one of the King's advisers.⁷³ Repeatedly thereafter he was on commissions at home and abroad. Among the ambassadors to Paris in February, 1391 to persuade Charles VI "to abandon his projected expedition against Boniface IX" was Clifford.⁷⁴ A ticklish mission for a heretic! When Derby was in Prussia (1391) Clifford became his attorney. In 1392 he was an executor of the Duchess of York.⁷⁵ He was thoroughly in sympathy with crusades; consequently he could not have been a Wycliffite.⁷⁶ Finally, Derby on his Prussian expedition made an offering "in die anniuersarii filii Lowys Clifford"—a pious act with no taint of heresy.

Nor is there anything unorthodox in the life of Sir Richard Stury.⁷⁷ His long connections at court are familiar. He too was often on diplomatic missions, and his friendship with Froissart is a matter of history. Like Clifford he was in obscurity from 1386 to 1389.⁷⁸ Seemingly complete proof of his religious views appears in the following. In 1392 he likewise (with Clifford) became an executor of the Duchess of York, and was to provide for the repose of her soul.⁷⁹

Sir John Cheyne's career offers nothing contradictory. He was apparently a landed gentleman (itself evidence of conservatism), and MP. Gloucester in 1390, 1393 and 1394.⁸⁰ In the latter year he accompanied the King on his expedition to Ireland, later serving the Earl of March there (Chaucer, we recall, had been made forester in 1390 by the Earl). The most important event (from

⁷¹ Kittredge, *Mod. Phil.*, I, 1 ff.; *ibid.*, XIV, 513 ff.; Waugh, *op. cit.*

⁷² Cf. *P. M. L. A.*, XXXVIII (1923), 126.

⁷³ On Vache, Clifford and Stury see *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1389, 92, 301).

⁷⁴ Waugh, 59.

⁷⁵ *Test. Vet.*, I, 135; cf. Waugh, 60; Kittredge, *Mod. Phil.*, I.

⁷⁶ Cf. Tatlock, *op. cit.*, and Maxfield, *op. cit.*

⁷⁷ See Waugh for his life.

⁷⁸ Waugh, 67.

⁷⁹ Cf. Waugh, 66.

⁸⁰ See Waugh for facts.

our point of view) has to do with the petition of 1390. It was he who was sent to Rome with letters concerning the new statute, and probably with the petition itself.

What are the conclusions? It is impossible to see wherein these three knights held religious convictions greatly at variance with the King. That they stood for liberal thought, as well as for greater purity within the church, is of course probable. In fact, it is altogether likely that it was partly for this reason that they were chosen royal advisers.⁸¹

We come now to Chaucer himself! What were his beliefs at this period? Does he anywhere echo the public state of mind? That he was conscious of the turmoil goes without saying; he too had shared the misfortune in 1386. His thorough knowledge of the workings of the church is sufficient proof of his sensitiveness to his environment. Accordingly, it should cause no surprise if he furnished a clue.⁸²

⁸¹ Cf. n. 69.

⁸² Since the language of the 1390 petition parallels at times that of previous remonstrances, it might be thought that the letter is merely another conventional one. But a comparison will show that the latter one contains more grievances, and in greater detail. Anyway, the fact still remains that Richard seized the reins in 1389, at a time when all devout Churchmen deplored the ecclesiastical evils (cf. Deanesley, *op. cit.*, 229). Now York, as seen, was the center of attack (space forbids my presenting much evidence showing that the government officials at London were in very many instances natives of Holderness and vicinity, and that they held an amazing number of the ecclesiastical preferments in Yorkshire). But the one person in whom is focussed the clash between church and state—at a time when was threatened the very existence of Richard and his followers, including the court poet Chaucer—was Skirlawe, papal favorite and former archdeacon of Holderness. Hence it is unthinkable that the poet's audience was unconscious of these facts. Holderness (cf. n. 85) remained a source of anxiety for some years.

Yorkshire had given trouble before. In 1381 Archb. Neville decided upon a visitation at Beverley (Holderness: cf. Thompson, *Hold.*, Hull, 1824 and map). The canons immediately published a protest, giving as one of their reasons that the Archbishop interfered with their private jurisdiction ("Beverley Chapter Act Book," *Surtees Soc.*, vol. 108, II, 205-265, especially 208, 217; cf. lxxiv ff.). Neville's summoner was Ralph de Selby, king's clerk in the chancery (*ibid.*, 202-4, 258). Only three of the chapter—none of whom was employed at Chancery—took the oath of office. The rest—eight, four of whom were chancery clerks—were pronounced contumacious. The affair was well known at London, for the Archbishop's

In *Bukton* mention was made that the choice of Holderness for a setting was probably not a chance one. It seems possible now to go one step further; for to all appearances the tales of the Friar and Sumner reflect public opinion c. 1390.

The *Friar's Tale* begins,

Whilom ther was dwellinge in my contree
 An erchedeken, a man of heigh degree,
 That boldely dide execucion
 In punisshinge of fornicacioun,
 Of wicchecraft, and eek of bauderye,
 Of diffamacioun, and avoutrye,
 Of chirche-reves, and of testaments,
 Of contractes, and of lakke of sacraments.
 Of usure and of symonye also.
 But certes lechours dide he grettest wo;
 They sholden singen, if that they were hent;
 And smale tytheres weren foule y-shent.
 If any persone wolde up-on hem pleyne,
 Ther mighte asterte him no pecunial peyne.
 For smale tythes and for smal offringe
 He made the peple pitously to singe.

mandate was read at Ludgate and St. Paul's (*ibid.*, 108, 216). The case was, as far as is known, the most notorious of its kind (cf. Capes, *A Hist. of the Eng. Church in the Fourteenth Century*, London, 1900, 236). Now of these four employed at Chancery one was Skirlawe. Since the Archbishop's visitation had been made in March, we probably have the true explanation of Skirlawe's extended visit to Rome that year. His mission to the pope produced its results. Neville (though entirely within his rights, as the canons confessed that no canon kept his residence according to statute, *Beverley Chap. Book*, 248) was condemned by the Lords Appellants in 1388—the only ecclesiast thus accused—and the pope appointed his successor. Neville's visitation was still a live issue with the Gloucester party in 1388: the Parliament (held at Cambridge) stated that the vicars of Beverley, who had also been driven out ("Beverley Chap Book," *op. cit.*, lxxvii; *Victoria Co. Hist. York*, III, 40; *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1385-9, 46), "have led and still lead a miserable existence" ("Victoria," *op. cit.*, 182). As a result, Parliament ordered their reinstatement (*Beverley Chap. Act Book*, lxxxi).

Neville met his fate in 1388, though being a churchman was spared the gallows. The pope transferred him to "schismatic" St. Andrews. But he "could not approach [it] since England and Scotland were at war" (Oman, 110). Meanwhile (June 30, 1390) jurisdiction over the English subjects in the diocese of St. Andrews was given by the pope to Skirlawe ("Scriptores Tres.," *Surtees Soc.*, 1839, clx ff.)!

For er the bisshop caughte hem with his hook,
 They weren in the erchedekenes book.
 Thanne hadde he, thurgh his jurisdicioun,
 Power to doon on hem correccioun.
 He hadde a Somnour redy to his hond,
 A slyer boy was noon in Engelond.
 For subtilly he hade his espialle,
 That taughte him, wher that him mighte availle.

The concreteness (with the delicious reference to the archdeacon who punishes simony) of these lines is in Chaucer's best vein. In view of the notoriousness of Holderness, it is difficult to believe that the name was chosen merely for its rhyme.

There is a startling piece of evidence to support this view. Queen Anne upon coming to England in 1381 was given Holderness in her own right.⁸³ In 1388, however, the lordship was seized by Gloucester.⁸⁴ Now church (Skirlawe and other arch-supporters of the pope⁸⁵) and state (Gloucester and his faction) were solidly united in making "mersshy Holdernesse" their spoils.⁸⁶ That the

⁸³ Poulson, *Holderness*, I, 69.

⁸⁴ As Duke of Albemarle (his title in 1385) he was technically entitled to Holderness (*D. N. B.*, LVI, 154; Dugdale, *Baronage*, II, 170, is cited).

⁸⁵ The archdeaconry of East Riding was, as far as known, not held by S. after 1386 (cf. n. 18). In 1383, however, it was seemingly granted (by the pope) to a Roman cardinal (Le Neve, III, 142; his reference I am unable to identify). (We recall that Skirlawe had been in Rome in 1381 and 1382.) Again July 26, 1389 the same cardinal received the appointment (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1388-92, 91). This was but a few weeks after Richard returned to power. Finally, in 1393 or 94 Wm. Feriby, king's clerk, was granted it (cf. *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1391-6, 391; Le Neve, III, 142). There seems to have been trouble in Feriby's case, too, for he did not actually obtain the place until 1397 (*ibid.*, 1396-9, 62). Feriby seemingly was a follower of Gloucester (*Cal. Close Rolls*, 1385-9, 608).

It should be emphasized that this archdeaconry offered nothing peculiar in having aliens. From the pages of Le Neve, however, one gets the impression that the evil was more wide-spread in Yorkshire than elsewhere. Incidentally, it was also worse after 1376 or 1377.

⁸⁶ Is there a further allusion in the tales of the Friar and Sumner to the poverty in those remote parts? Eastern Yorkshire must have been sparsely settled. Not only had the plague taken a heavy toll, but it was so low that much of it was gradually swallowed by the North Sea (cf. Thomas Sheppard, *The Lost Towns of Yorkshire*, London, 1912, 60 ff.). Matters of drainage came up in the 14th c. (Boyle, *History of Hedon*, 73, 75). A reference in an early 17th c. will may be cited in this connection.

poet and the court (which included besides the ruling classes such men as Clifford and Clanvowe)⁸⁷ were unconscious of these facts is highly improbable.

Finally, the choice of Cambridge for the setting of the *Reve's Tale* substantiates like inferences. In *Bukton* mention was made of the fact that Gloucester's Parliament met at "Soler Hall" (Cambridge) in September, 1388 and that seemingly the poet's choice of that university town was determined by this fact. Now the reader will recall that the two students were from the north,

Of o toun that highte Strother,
Fer in the north (A 4014 f.).⁸⁸

Where in the north? Had the poet any particular locality in mind? To all appearances, yes, if a remark of one of the youths is a clue:

'Now, Symond,' seyde John, 'by seint Cutberd' (A 4127).

In other words, the students were from the diocese of Durham.⁸⁹ Now Skirlawe had become bishop of Durham April 3, 1388,—the

Provision is made for the maintenance of a schoolmaster at S. Skirlawe (native community of W. S.). The candidate must be university bred, "no Drunkard, no Swearer, no Blasphemer," and unmarried, for "I hold itt unnecessary for a Man living in so barren a place as Skirlaugh is to have the use of a Woman" (Thompson, *Swine*, 186 ff.).

⁸⁷ Did Chaucer have in mind, as Skeat says (v. 326), the old joke that the Devil, according to Teutonic mythology, dwelt in the north (cf. *Friar's Tale*, 1380 ff.)? If so, his attack was double-edged. Additional references to Skeat's are the following: Tupper and Ogle (transl.), W. Map's *De Nugis*, 1923, 201. On Blake's views see F. Damon's *Blake*, 1924, 68.

A curious parallel is in the ballad of Robin Hood. Little John says he was born in Holderness (Cambridge ed., p. 263), and Robin Hood is called the yeoman of the forest (*ibid.*, 267). The Devil in the *Friar's T.* was disguised as a yeoman, and dwelt "fer in the north contree" (D. 1413).

⁸⁸ Chaucer adds characteristically, "I can nat telle where."

⁸⁹ St. Cuthbert's shrine was at D. Cathedral; an altar at Howden. Skeat noted that a Strother family existed in Northumberland, though no town by that name is known. The Diocese of Durham embraced not only the palatinate but Northumberland as well, and some of Yorkshire (Lapsley, *op. cit.*, 116 n., 300). I have found that in 1378 Alan Strother was on a commission to enquire into the defects of a Northumberland castle, which Richard Stury had been keeper of (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1377-81, 127). I hope soon to discuss the background of the *M. of Law's Tale*.

Is it also significant that the Miller (*Reve's T.*, 13) carried a Sheffield (Yorkshire) knife?

very time that Gloucester obtained control of Parliament, and five months before his Parliament met at Cambridge. Not only does the *Reve's Tale* illuminate the poet's outlook on contemporary society,⁹⁰ but it strongly reinforces conclusions already drawn in this paper.

Chaucer's attitude toward the established church now seems clear. His sympathies—religious and political, for they were inseparable—were (as we should expect) with Richard's party. In giving the *Sumner's Tale* a local setting, he is following an earlier example. But in the sumner's mention of Holderness there is more; for behind the smile of this prince of humorists also lurks a satiric allusion,⁹¹ a reference to contemporary events that must have moved his hearers—now safely⁹² seated in power—to uproarious laughter.

The portrait of the poor parson substantiates the conclusion that the poet was opposed to the vices in the church; for the ideals of this perfect shepherd parallel the views set forth in the protest to Rome.⁹³ But this remonstrance to the papal court represents (as noted) the enlightened public opinion of the day—in its renewed emphasis upon the essentials of Christ's teachings.⁹⁴

E. P. KUHL.

Goucher College.

⁹⁰ Chaucer's rollicking humor and his apparent indifference towards existing conditions seemingly give point to his philosophy in *Vache*. My conclusions do not clash with views held on dates of the F.-S. tales. It is interesting in this connection to note that Richard moved his court to York city in 1392 (Higden, ix, 267-70).

⁹¹ How much humor did Chaucer's audience see in the fact that it is the Sumner's—not the Friar's—story that is localized at Holderness?

⁹² Armitage-Smith, 341. It is interesting—possibly important if we knew all the facts—that Wm. LeSerope had to do penance in 1390 at the shrine of St. Cuthbert for having done "certain trespasses" to Skirlawe. Clanvowe was the King's adviser in the matter (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1388-92, 178).

⁹³ It might be urged since the description of the poor parson was written c. 1387, that my point is thereby weakened. But by Oct. 1386 England was in a turmoil, and the petition in 1390 was merely the breaking forth of a long-smouldering fire. Anyway, what proof is there that *all* the GP was composed at a stretch? I hope presently to approach this matter from another angle.

⁹⁴ One recalls the important position assigned to the *Parson's Tale*.

DANTE NOTES

VII. "FEARS NO SOPS" (*Purg.*, XXXIII, 36)

The She Wolf who in *Inf.*, I, more than any other animal causes Dante, representing humanity, to lose hope of gaining the sunlit heights (line 54) is to be, some fair day, driven by the Greyhound back to Hell, whence Envy first set her loose (line 111). Now Envy, in *Inf.*, XIII, 64-6, is called "the harlot who never took her lewd eyes from the hospice of Caesar, death universal and the vice of courts" *par excellence*. In *Purg.*, XX, pitying those tortured for Avarice, Dante breaks into bitter invective against that "ancient She Wolf," whose prey exceeds that of all other beasts (lines 10-11) and asks (line 15), "when he shall come, by whom she shall be put to flight." Thereupon Hugh Capet in savage irony gives assurance that the second infamous Charles of the three from his line, he of Valois, is *not* to be that valiant Hound — not only sneering at his nickname "Senzaterra," but also parodying perhaps the famous line of *Inf.*, I, 103: "*Questi non ciberà terra nè peltro*" with the words (*Purg.*, XX, 76-7): "*Quindi non terra, ma peccato e onta / guadagnerà*" — and concludes with an answering cry of anguished supplication (lines 94-5): "O my Lord, when shall I see thy vengeance (*vendetta*)?"

In *Purg.*, XXXIII, 35-6, Beatrice assures Dante that "the one who is to blame for the damage and dishonor suffered by the Sacred Vessel of the Church" — evidently meaning, first of all, that "loose harlot" of *Purg.*, XXXII, 149, the corrupt Papacy, or better, papal Corruption — "may believe that the vengeance (*vendetta*) of God fears no *suppe*." And seven lines later she predicts that "515" (or "1515"), evidently one and the same with the Veltro, the Hound, of *Inf.*, I, who shall slay "*la fuia*" — the now *slinking* harlot — and the giant too. To this, especially to the *suppe*, we shall return presently.

Finally, in *Par.*, XXVII, 55-7, while all the heavenly company blush for shame, St. Peter arraigns the Church's degeneracy and worldliness with the words: "In shepherds' clothes rapacious wolves are seen from here throughout all the pastures; O defence of God, why dost thou yet (or 'merely') remain lying?"—for thus,

with the canny Buti, honor of early commentators, I interpret this; *i. e.*, 'why dost thou still delay to charge like a faithful and efficient shepherd dog, but liest yet inactive watching the ravaging wolves?'

In all the foregoing passages one single general concept shines forth: a valiant defender of the Truth and of Holiness shall discomfit and put to flight the Church's Corruptor; and more or less explicitly the poet's imagination seems to have been pervaded by the figure of a mighty and swift Hound, who shall utterly rout the preying wolves, the She Wolf of Avarice in particular and of all greeds and lusts in general, which defile and ravish the Church. For in Old Italian *lupa* (*vulg. lova*) meant not only "she wolf" but also "*harlot*";¹ and this is the Harlot of Papal Corruption, whose paramour was the Giant of Temporal Entanglements.

If it is incredible that Italian expositors should have overlooked this double significance of *lupa*, it is still more so that the English along with other foreign commentators have wrestled so long, and sometimes so ludicrously, with *suppe*, in *Purg.*, XXXIII, 36; its obvious bearing and meaning is that the Hound of Heaven's Vengeance is not to be cheated of his prey with *sops*, as was Cerberus by the Sibyl's *offa* in *Aeneid*, VI, 420, or by the handfuls of mud with which Dante saw Vergil quiet him in the third circle of hell — gluttonous guard of the gluttonous, and like them greedy for *earth* (*terra*) and the things of earth.² It was indeed a vile sop which sufficed to appease him: Dante had fully described its composition a few lines earlier (*Inf.*, VI, 10-12):

Grandine grossa, acqua tinta e neve
per l'aere tenebroso si riversa;
pute la *terra* che questo riceve.

¹ This fact as to the secondary meaning of *lupa* lends much weight to the very satisfactory and appealing interpretation of the Three Beasts of *Inf.*, I, which makes them symbolize, respectively: the *lonza*, lust of the eye; the *lupa*, lust of the flesh; and the *leone*, pride of life. (I. John, 2, 16: "quoniam omne, quod est in mundo, concupiscentia carnis est, & concupiscentia oculorum, & superbia vitae: quae non est ex Patre, sed ex mundo est.")

² *Inf.*, VI, 25 ff. Cerberus forgets all else, as like a famished cur he gulps down the *terra*; while the avenger Hound of I, 101, will disdain to eat of "*terra nè peltro*."

Well might he refer to handfuls of it as "sops," and contemptuously aver that no such would ever be feared by God's Avenger.

The commentator Pietro, Dante's own son, explaining these *suppe* of *Purg.*, XXXIII, 36, equates *suppa* with the Latin *offa* ("... *offa*, sive *suppa* ..."), and can hardly have been more ignorant of the fact than was his father — who "knew all of Vergil" — that it was an *offa* with which the Sibyl quieted Cerberus. How then arose the dust of doubt that finally seems to have hidden the simple explanation of Dante's *suppe* from the eyes of commentators during the last half-millennium?

It seems to have been stirred up by the fact that the earliest among them, after alleging a Greek custom — on what basis I shall indicate later—in accordance with which vendetta might be averted if a murderer ate sops for a period upon his victim's grave,³ went on, in that accommodating and facile vein so unhappily characteristic of commentators old, middle, and recent, to add that 'this was also the custom in Italy,' and even that Florentine families, in particular, were wont to provide against such evasions by keeping guard for nine days over the tombs of their murdered dear ones. Which assertion naturally found its skeptical critics,⁴ and the controversy was on. Meanwhile the obvious equation: *suppa* = *offa* was forgotten.

I promised, a bit back, to justify the earliest commentators in their predication of a Greek origin for this custom. Accepting as undisputed the equivalence of the "honey-cake" (*offa*) of *Aeneid*, VI, 420, with the Greek *μελιτόεσσα* (sc. *μάζα*), Attic *μελιτούττα*,⁵ the whole matter becomes reasonably clear when we read, for example, in Suidas' *Lexicon*, s. v. *μελιτούττα*: . . . Ἰστέον ὅτι ἡ μελιτούττα ἐδίδοτο τοῖς νεκροῖς, ὡς εἰς τὸν Κέρβερον, "Be it known that honey-cake was given to the dead, as [of use with regard] to

³ E. g., Lana: "Qui il Poeta intromette un' usanza, ch' era anticamente nelle parti di Grecia, che se uno uccidea un altro, ed egli poteva andare nove di continui a mangiare una suppa suso la sepoltura del defuncto nel comune, i parenti del morto non faceano più nessuna vendetta."

⁴ Buti, not unexpectedly, among the first.

⁵ Authoritative, for example, is E. Norden, *Aeneis*, Buch VI, erklärt von, Leipzig, 1903 (Teubner), p. 237, note to VI, 420: "Besonders kühn ist, wie er 420 die μελιτούττα wiedergibt: melle soporata et medicatis frugibus offam."

Cerberus"—that is, freely, "to use on Cerberus";⁶ the method and purpose of its use was too familiar to require further explanation. Dante's early commentators somehow knew of this Greek custom and of the related method of avoiding vendetta—whether Dante himself did or did not is immaterial to his own poem and to its exegesis—and it may well have been not entirely, or not at all, through the literary traditions that they knew of it; the first Charles (d'Anjou) is said by the False Boccaccio to have brought it from France⁷ and to have used it at the slaughter of Conradin and his nobles in Naples; but it is likelier on the face of it that the custom was Neapolitan—or more probably, known to all the ancient Greek domain.

I have not yet pursued the subject through all its bypaths; but I feel satisfied that Dante's *suppe* of *Purg.*, XXXIII, 36, is simply the equivalent of our familiar English "*sop* to Cerberus"—plural perhaps not only for the rime and to give general or "repeated" sense, but also because of Cerberus' three mouths—and that if the commentators had been more honest as to the prevalence of the sop-eating custom in Florentine territory, the attention of later students would not have been so long diverted from the correct interpretation.

HERBERT D. AUSTIN.

University of Southern California.

⁶ The rest of the outfitting of the dead for their trans-Stygian journey is thus itemized in the concluding phrases of this passage: καὶ ὀβολὸς μισθὸς τῷ πορθμῇ· καὶ στέφανος, ὡς τὸν βίον διηγωνισμένοις (Suidae *Lexicon Graece et Latine* . . . post Thomam Gaisfordum recensuit et annotatione critica instruxit Godofredus Bernhardt. Halis et Brunsvigae 1853. 2 vols., Vol. II, cols. 769-770. The Latin translation there given of our passage is: "Sciendum est, placentam mellitam mortuis dari solitam ad placandum Cerberum; et obolum, naulum portitori; et coronam, ut vitae certamine defunctis."

⁷ At least, his slovenly Italian seems to mean that: ". . . questa usanza arrecò Carlo senza terra di Francia, che quando egli sconfisse e prese Curradino con gli altri baroni de la Magna e fece loro tagliare la testa in Napoli, e poi dice che feciono fare le suppe e mangiaronle sopra quei corpi morti, cioè Carlo con gli altri suoi baroni, dicendo che mai non se ne farebbe vendetta." The "senza terra" in the above is an evident mistake.

ON THE CHRONOLOGY OF THOMAS KYD'S PLAYS.

Was Thomas Kyd's dramatic work contemporary with or precedent to that of Marlowe, Greene, and Shakespeare? Upon the answer to this question will hinge some fairly important points in Elizabethan dramatic history. The question has been complicated by the fact that Kyd ceased dramatic activity some time before his death. It has been further complicated, I believe, by a misreading of Kyd's own statement upon the matter. In a letter to Sir John Puckering,¹ Kyd is rather contemptuous of mere playwrights in general, and Marlowe in particular, leading us to infer that he gave up such low pursuits as writing plays when he entered the service of his Lord, from which he had but recently been ejected.² Thus the beginning of this service determines the end of Kyd's dramatic career.

Boas reads Kyd's statement of the length of service as "almost theis iij yeres nowe";³ but I must read "vj yeres nowe." A powerful binocular will make it evident at a glance that we have here a slightly blotted v followed by a j, the regular Elizabethan form of terminal i; but the same thing is on careful examination apparent to the naked eye.⁴ Since the last figure is clearly a j, the question is whether we are to read the first part as "v" or "ii." The initial stroke of Kyd's v differs from his i in four respects. It begins far below the line instead of on or above, has greater height above the line, is undotted, and has a left-hand spur at the end, preparatory to the concluding curve. The initial stroke here clearly has all four of these characteristics. The second element

¹ Boas, *Kyd*, facsimile, cviii-cx.

² Boas, *Kyd*, xxiv-xxv.

³ An examination of the facsimile will show that in order to read Kyd's statement as "iij" we must suppose that he had dotted only the final j, whereas he is very careful to dot his i's; that he has made the second i almost without height and with rounded outlines; that he has connected the j almost with the top of the second i instead of with the bottom; that he has made the first i unduly high; that he has begun it below instead of above the line; and that he has made irregularly a left-hand spur at the conclusion of the first i.

⁴ I owe thanks to Professor Robert K. Root of Princeton for suggestions on the presentation of this technical point.

is also more easily interpreted as the conclusion of a v than as a second i. It is to be noticed that in forming his v Kyd makes a slight spur to the left at the bottom of this initial minim as a change of direction for his pen when he starts the curve around and back to the shaft, which completes the letter. This spur is distinctly visible here but cannot regularly be accounted for if the second element is interpreted as being i. The curve is only slightly irregular for the ending of v. Its general outline is correct, the chief difficulty being that the curve returns to the shaft somewhat lower than is ordinary. But since under any interpretation the pen has blotted slightly here, and rather frequently for several lines, we need only suppose that this was the cause of the slight deviation in direction. I take it then that Kyd wrote "vj" and not "ijj."

The context itself implies that "ijj" is incorrect, since Kyd speaks of two years as only a short time but speaks of this term as a long time. Further, six years fits exactly into our other facts. Since Kyd wrote this letter about the autumn of 1593,⁵ "almost theis vj yeres nowe" would carry us back to the latter part of 1587. Now Boas⁶ has already shown that Kyd had turned at least temporarily to a different kind of work by 1588, in which year appeared *The Householdiers Philosophie*. Since this work was entered S. R. February 6, 1588,⁷ the actual work of translation was doubtless done in or before 1587. It is probably significant then that we have but one known piece of work from Kyd's pen between this translation of 1588 and that of *Cornelia* in 1594, after Kyd had lost his place. In the interim, he did not need to support himself by hackwork of any kind.

Too, Kyd's own statement of the time and circumstances of his meeting Marlowe is significant. Kyd says his acquaintance with Marlowe "rose vpon his bearing name to serve my Lo: although his L^p never knewe his service, but in writing for his plaiers."⁸ The occasion and approximate time of this meeting was "o^r wrytinge in one chamber twoe yeares synce" from the autumn of 1593, which presumably would be in 1591. But this association did not last long. Says Kyd, "aswell by my lords

⁵ Boas, *Kyd*, lxxiii ff.

⁶ Boas, *Kyd*, lxii.

⁷ Arber, *Transcript*, II, 484.

⁸ Boas, *Kyd*, cviii-cix.

commandmt as in hatred of his life & thoughts I left & did refrain his companie."⁹ He also intimates that he had not long continued the association, and refers to "when I sawe him last." Thus the acquaintance of Kyd with Marlowe began about 1591, and their close association probably did not outlast the year, certainly was of short duration.

Had Kyd been in close touch with dramatic work, it is impossible that he should not have met Marlowe in 1587 or shortly after. This conclusion is made even stronger by the fact that both men pretty certainly wrote for the same organization.¹⁰ But, if so, Kyd's work must have been done before Marlowe began writing for the company the autumn 1587, since otherwise, under the conditions of the times, Kyd would certainly have met Marlowe then. I take it therefore that by the autumn of 1587, at the age of twenty-nine, Kyd ceased writing for the stage to enter the household of "my Lo."¹¹ This means that as a dramatist he was unquestionably the predecessor of Marlowe, Greene, and Shakespeare.

This account of things also frees Kyd from some of the insinuations and worse that overzealous defenders of Marlowe have thrown out against him. It seems clear that Kyd's contact with Marlowe was but accidental, of short duration, and of no intimacy. It is to be hoped that any one of us who may have found it expedient to share lodgings with another for some weeks or even months in hotel or rooming house is not to be held responsible for the deeds and opinions of that person, and may even criticise them vigorously should occasion arise. Of course, we may admire Marlowe's strenuous attempt to think for himself on religious problems, even if he did severely shock the decided majority of religious thinkers in his day. But the very fact that they were so shocked gives Kyd his sufficient excuse likewise to voice his disapproval. Certainly, here is no double-dyed villain, betraying a life-long friend.

The fact that Kyd ceased writing for the stage in or before 1587 enables us to date his plays a little more closely. The only sur-

⁹ Brown, *Lond. Times, L. S.*, June 2, 1921.

¹⁰ This I have demonstrated in detail in work as yet unpublished.

¹¹ I shall show elsewhere that "my Lo" was pretty certainly Pembroke.

viving play, known on external evidence to be his, is *The Spanish Tragedy*, dated on Jonson's statement 1584-9, which would be narrowed by our evidence above to 1584-7. Quite likely Kyd wrote a first part to this play, presumably beforehand; but Boas is certainly correct, I think, in rejecting the surviving *First Part of Jeronimo* as this play. He seems also correct in his attribution of *Soliman and Perseda* to Kyd. The play was entered S. R. November 22, 1592. If it belongs to Kyd, it should date before the autumn of 1587. It has been pointed out that the play antedates the Armada, since the Spanish knight and Spanish bravery are praised. Now the complimentary reference to Queen Elizabeth at the end of the play shows that this is a court version. Certainly no man in his right mind would have attempted to subject the Queen's ears to such praise of Spain after the open hostilities of 1588. Since the Spaniard had been preparing against England as early as 1585, and had been confidently expected to launch his blow in 1587,¹² this very favorable reference hardly is so late as 1587 and probably is considerably earlier.

Death's curious compliment to Queen Elizabeth must belong to those grim years 1584-6. Says Death:

I [aye], now will *Death*, in his most haughtie pride,
Fetch his imperiall Carre from deepest hell,
And ride in triumph through the wicked world;
Sparing none but sacred *Cynthias* friend,
Whom *Death* did feare before her life began:
For holy fates haue grauen it in their tables
That *Death* shall die, if he attempt her end,
Whose life is heauens delight, and *Cynthias* friend.

In his statement that the fated law is "*Death* shall die, if he attempt her end" there is a direct allusion to current events. In October 1584, following the murder of the Prince of Orange in July, an association was formed in England under pledge to exterminate all who should attempt to harm the Queen or procure her death, the object being to protect her from Queen Mary's plotters.¹³ Shortly after, Parliament met; and following long discussion as to the best procedure, finally passed an act in March 1585 embodying the features of the pledge. Here is the fated

¹² Lodge, *Illustrations*, II, 275, 302-3, 341, 353, etc.; D. N. B., Elizabeth.

¹³ D. N. B., Elizabeth.

law. In the midst of the debate, came the trial and condemnation of Parry Feb. 25, 1585 on the charge of attempting to compass the death of the Queen, this being the event that incited Parliament to final action.¹⁴ On April 20, it was considered wise to put Queen Mary under close guard, which was made yet closer early in 1586. The Babington conspirators were tried and condemned September 13, and Queen Mary brought to trial October 14 and 15, 1586, all on the charge of trying to compass Queen Elizabeth's death. Too, at least one T. K., probably Kyd himself, had contributed in 1586 to "Verses of Praise and Joy" over Elizabeth's escape from the Babington conspiracy.¹⁵ Clearly Death refers to these strenuous measures of this strenuous period to guard Queen Elizabeth from death, and thus is speaking not earlier than the court season 1584-5. It seems clear too that the reference could have been conceived and received as a compliment only in the first full flush of enthusiasm, while it might be proffered as the pledge of the actors along with those of other loyal subjects.¹⁶ For one did not lightly remind the Virgin Queen of age and death, and only on such an occasion might she be expected to consider the reminder as a compliment. Since the death of Mary relieved the tension, this allusion seems certainly to date 1584-6. Our information on plays at court the season 1584-5 is sufficiently definite to make it certain that *Soliman* was not among them.¹⁷ Besides, the law referred to was not passed till March 1585. Elizabeth's acting or earnest over the sentence and final execution of Mary would pretty certainly rule out the court season 1586-7 as a decidedly inopportune time for this allusion. We thus have the court season 1585-6 left as the most fitting, and seemingly only possible, time for the allusion. Now if the play was Kyd's, it probably belonged to the Admiral's company, whose last recorded appearances at court before the Armada were Dec. 27, 1585 and January 6, 1586,¹⁸ exactly where our allusion seems to fit. Presumably this is the company's first play at court after passage of the law, and hence the one of December 27, 1585.

¹⁴ D'Ewes, *Journals*, 355.

¹⁵ Boas, *Kyd*, xxv-xxvi, 340-1.

¹⁶ One should read Froude's account of these events to get some idea of how profoundly Englishmen were stirred; or Spedding, *Bacon*, I, 14-16, 25 ff.

¹⁷ Chambers, *Eliz. Stage*, IV, 100-101. ¹⁸ Chambers, *op. cit.*, IV, 101-2.

Still another point possibly indicates this same dating. If the play was the Admiral's, Alleyn's part in the play would, I think, have been Erastus, who is "not twentie yeares of age,"¹⁹ whereas in the source he is but about sixteen. Now Alleyn was born September 1566 and would have been twenty in September 1586. It is likely then that the age of Erastus is really the age of the performer, Alleyn, as was regularly the case, for instance, in the Shakespearean company. If so, the play dates before September 1586 and possibly after September 1585. It seems certain then that *Soliman and Perseda* dates 1585-6, almost certainly the autumn 1585.

Further, *The Spanish Tragedy* certainly precedes *Soliman and Perseda*, whether Kyd wrote the latter or not. Boas has given strong reasons for this relation, and has furnished materials in the parallels between the plays for conclusive proof. He finds,²⁰ as I count, nine changes and additions in *Soliman and Perseda* not found in the source but paralleling *The Spanish Tragedy*. Since these parallels are too close and too numerous to be merely accidental, we must suppose that one play has consciously paralleled the other. This granted, one must conclude that *Soliman and Perseda* succeeds *The Spanish Tragedy* since it varies from its source for the purpose of introducing parallels to *The Spanish Tragedy*, many of them extraneous and almost purposeless—as for instance the brother-killing scene—whereas their analogues in *The Spanish Tragedy* were vital to the story. If *Soliman and Perseda* dates the autumn 1585, then *The Spanish Tragedy* would date not later than the summer 1585. Since *Soliman* cannot date later than the autumn 1586, *The Spanish Tragedy* cannot date later than the summer 1586. Boas²¹ shows that the latter play certainly is not earlier than 1582 and gives some faint indications for 1585 as the upper limit. The date of *The Spanish Tragedy* would thus certainly be 1582-6, almost certainly 1582-5, and *The First Part of Jeronimo* would precede. If Boas' suggested allusions for 1585 could be trusted, we could pretty certainly date the play the summer 1585. But I feel on grounds of literary style that *The Spanish Tragedy* is considerably earlier than *Soliman*, and should thus be disposed to place it near 1582,

¹⁹ III, 1, 18.

²⁰ Boas, *Kyd*, lvii-lix.

²¹ Boas, *Kyd*, xxix.

taking the reference to the "late conflict" between Spain and Portugal as an allusion to the final one of 1580,²² in which England was so much interested that she long supported the Portuguese pretender, Don Antonio, as a threat against Spain.²³

Besides these plays, various others have been attributed to Kyd, the *Ur-Hamlet* probably most persistently, chiefly on the strength of Nash's well-known gibe at the play in the summer 1589. But even if Nash should be pointing at Kyd in the same connection, he is mentioning him as only one of "a sort of shifting companions," so that *Hamlet* may have been written by anyone else of "these men." Besides, Nash says "these men" have turned from Senecan plays to Italian translations, so that he is not necessarily referring to Kyd as an active playwright. Now the *Ur-Hamlet*, I think, we can date for this summer 1589, its newness being the occasion of Nash's attention, though the indications for this dating I reserve for discussion in another connection. If the play does so date, then Kyd must almost certainly be freed from responsibility for it.

Of course, much of our evidence concerning Kyd's work is not even yet so definite as we could wish. Still we are now certain of one important point, and that is that Kyd had ceased writing for the stage when Marlowe, Greene, and Shakespeare began. This should mean among other things that the honor of popularizing blank verse is to be passed, at least partially, to Kyd, though our evidence is too scant to give any assurance that even Kyd was the first to popularize this form. Too much of the evidence has been lost, or obscured by the Elizabethan habit of revision for us to say or imply that blank verse sprang suddenly into favor on the popular stage. More probably it had been slowly and steadily gaining, till now in the hands of such men as Kyd and Marlowe it supplanted all other forms. But under any interpretation Marlowe must at least share honors with Kyd. As with blank verse, so with other dramatic contributions. The pioneer predecessor of these other men on the popular stage, Kyd merits greater credit than he has ordinarily received. His was a very important contribution to the development of Elizabethan drama.

Goucher College.

T. W. BALDWIN.

²² Boas, *Kyd*, xxx-xxxi.

²³ Hume, *Burghley*, Index, Antonio.

COLLE'S BORROWING FROM THE SULLY MEMOIRS

La Partie de Chasse de Henri IV, a play written in eulogy of the most idolized of French kings, contributed in a large measure to the vulgarization of the Henri IV legend in France. It is but one of many dramatizations of the universally popular theme of the king and his subject.¹ The author, Charles Collé (1709-1783), noted in his preface that he had borrowed very freely from Robert Dodsley's *The King and the Miller of Mansfield*.² He furthermore stated that he drew on the Sully memoirs for historical documentation of the first act of the play.³

It has never been definitely pointed out how and to what extent the Sully memoirs served Collé. Several critics have noted the attribution without, however, indicating the scope of such influences or mentioning the passages in question.⁴ Obviously a mere reference to an eight volume set of memoirs constitutes but a feeble indication of source.⁵

The first act of the play is a dramatic reconciliation scene between the king and his minister whose position is threatened by political enemies and jealous courtiers. The historical events which formed the background of Collé's scene are recorded by Sully in the year 1605, and the threatened rupture between Henri and Sully is reported in the *Oeconomies Royales* (vi, 150-165). The date of these events can be fixed as the last week of May, 1605, inasmuch as the account is preceded by a letter dated May 26 and followed by another bearing the date May 29, of this year.

¹ Other well known versions are *Le Roi et le Fermier* by Sedaine, and *Il Re Alla Caccia* by Goldoni, both in 1763.

² "Je ne dois pas laisser ignorer que j'ai pris le fond de ma pièce dans une comédie anglaise dont la traduction est imprimée." Collé, *Avertissement à La Partie de Chasse de Henri IV*.

³ "L'on verra aussi que les *Mémoires* de Sully ne m'ont pas été inutiles." *Ibid.*

⁴ Lenient states only that Collé composed his play on "des souvenirs historiques empruntés en grande partie aux *Mémoires* de Sully." *La Comédie Au XVIIIe Siècle*, II, 156.

⁵ Petitot, *Collection des Mémoires Relatifs à L'Histoire de France, Seconde Serie, Oeconomies Royales*, Paris, 1820.

The textual similitudes as well as the narrative threads of the play and its memoir sources are in many cases striking and reveal Collé as a student of the historical documents of his country. The following passages indicate what use he made of the Sully documents.

COLLÉ⁶

1. Sully: Avant son départ, votre Majesté n'aurait-elle point encore quelques ordres à me donner?
2. Henri: Mais n'auriez-vous rien à me dire qui vous regardât, vous, Monsieur?
3. Henri: Vous, mon cher Bellegarde, suivez-moi; j'ai un mot à vous dire sur votre gouvernement de Bourgogne.
4. Henri: prenant M. de Sully par la main: Eh bien Monsieur, la façon dont nous sommes ensemble, depuis six semaines; le froid que je vous marque, et la contrainte dans laquelle nous vivons vis à-vis l'un de l'autre. . . .
5. Sully: Quant aux satyres; et surtout, Sire au libelle fait par Juvigny. . . .⁷
6. Sully: Quel seroit mon but dans une trahison prise dans le grand? De me mettre votre couronne sur la tête? De la faire passer à quelqu'autre branche de votre Maison, ou à quelque Puissance étrangère!

SULLY⁷

Sully: Sire, vous plaist-il me commander quelque chose?

Henri: Venez-ça, n'avez vous rien du tout à me dire?

Henri: M. le grand, allons nous promener, car je veux parler à vous, afin que vous partiez des aujourd'huy pour vous en aller en Bourgogne.

Henri: Mon amy, je ne saurais plus souffrir, des experiences et cognoissances de vingt-trois ans nous ayant suffisamment tesmoigné l'affection et sincerité l'un de l'autre, les froideurs, retenues et dissimulations dont nous avons usé depuis un mois.

Henri: Les divers avis et memoires . . . comme celui que Juvigny me bailla. . . .

Sully: Car quels buts pourroy-je avoir, Sire, sinon deux seulement, à sçavoir; l'un de me vouloir approprier la couronne de France, et l'autre de la transférer de vous à autrui?

⁶ *La Partie de Chasse de Henri IV*, act I, Scenes 4-8 passim.

⁷ *Oeconomies Royales*, VI, 150 ff.

⁸ The title of this libel was: Discours d'Etat pour faire voir au Roi en quoi Sa Majesté est mal servie. See Dussieux, *Lettres Intimes de Henry IV*, 406, Paris, 1876.

7. Sully: Ah, Sire, permettez qu'avec les larmes de la joie je me précipite à vos pieds pour vous remercier. Sully: Et me permettez que je me jette à vos pieds et vous embrasse les genoux.
8. Henri: Relevez-vous donc; prenez donc garde; ces gens là qui nous voient, mais qui n'ont pas pu entendre ce que nous disons, vont croire que je vous pardonne. Henri: Non, ne le faites pas, car je ne voudrais pour rien du monde que ceux qui nous regardent creussent que vous eussiez commis aucune faute qui méritast une telle soumission.
9. Henri: Je suis bien aise, Messieurs, de vous déclarer à tous, que j'aime Rosny plus que jamais; et qu'entre lui et moi, c'est à la vie et à la mort. Henri: Je veux bien dire à tous que j'aime Rosny plus que jamais, et qu'entre luy et moy, c'est à la mort et à la vie.

University of Minnesota.

OLAV K. LUNDEBERG.

BEOWULF 159-163

Grendel, a fiend of hell (*Beow.* 101; cf. 120, 592), is by that token, a spirit of darkness (83, 703), inhabiting or commonly traversing murky and sombre regions (*misthleopum*, 710; *dýgel lond*, 1357; *næssa genipu*, 1360; *myrcan mōr*, 1405), of which some, at least, are high as well as dark (*misthleopum*, 710; *næssa genipu*, 1360; *stēap stānhliðo*, 1409). Among the regions thus inhabited are those designated by the word *mōr* (*sē þe mōras hēold*, 103; *ðā cōm of mōre under misthleopum*, 710; *micle mearcstapan mōras healdan*, 1340; *ofer myrcan mōr*, 1405). Of the passages which associate the notion of gloom with that of *mōr*, the following (159-163) calls for particular attention to the italicized words:

[Ac se] āglæca ēhtende wæs,
deorc deapscua, duguþe ond geogoþe,
 seomade ond syrede; sinnihte hēold
mistige mōras; men ne cunnon
 hwyder helrūnan hwyrftum scriþað.¹

¹ Thus translated by Clark Hall: "But the demon, the dark death-shadow, kept pursuing young and old; caught and entrapped them. Night

In this passage, what sense shall we attribute to *mistige mōras*? To the five occurrences of *mōr* in *Beowulf*, Grein (*Sprachschatz*) assigns the meanings *uligo*, *palus*, *stagnum*. The only other instance which he places under this head is *Dan.* 575. The remaining occurrences of the word, six in number, he defines as *mons*, *saltus*. *Dan.* 573-5 reads thus (Nebuchadnezzar is addressed):

ac þū lifgende lange þræge
heorta hlȳpum geond holt wunast;
ne bið þec mælmete nymðe mōres græs.²

In this case, *mōr* seems to mean *mountain* rather than *swamp*, because (1) of its association with the *holt* of the preceding line, somewhat as the *mōr* of *Beow.* 1405 is with the "steep, rocky slopes" of 1409 and the "mountain-trees" of 1414; (2) of the fact that the leaps of the deer seem to belong to firm rather than to marshy ground; (3) of the consideration that, as Nebuchadnezzar was "to eat grass as oxen" (*Dan.* 4. 25), it was rather more likely that he should pasture on upland (cf. *Ps.* 50. 10) than on quagmires.

Returning to *Beowulf* from this excursion, we may perhaps find a clue to the italicized words in the above lines by turning to *Jer.* 13. 16:

Date Domino Deo vestro gloriam antequam contenebrescat, et antequam offendant pedes vestri ad *montes caliginosos*; expectabitur lucem, et ponet eam in *umbram mortis* et in caliginem.³

after night he held the misty moors—men know not where such sorcerers go [glide about?] in their wanderings."

And thus by Grein (*Dichtungen der Angelsachsen*, 1857):

Der Unhold verfolgte unaufhörlich,
der unheimliche Todschaten, Alt und Jung.
Er lag Unheil brütend, bewohnte in ewiger Nacht
die Nebelmoore; nicht wissen Menschen
wohin sich wenden die Höllenzauberer.

² Thus translated by Grein:

sondern lebend sollst du lange Zeit
im Holze wohnen mit der Hirsche Sprünge;
keine Mundkost wirst du ausser Moorwaldes Gras
. . . finden.

³ The A. V. translates: "Give glory to the Lord your God before he cause darkness, and before your feet stumble upon the *dark mountains*, and, while ye look for light, he turn it into the *shadow of death*, and make it gross darkness."

That *mistige mōras* may well translate *montes caliginosos* is sufficiently established by the rendering of Isa. 13. 2 at the foot of page 18 of the *Durham Ritual* (ed. Stevenson), where *montem calig[in]osum* is glossed as *mōr mistig*—the noun and the adjective being nowhere else combined in the Vulgate. As for the translation of *mons* by *mōr*, I cite corresponding passages of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*:

Plummer 1. 267. 1: angustias inaccessorum montium
 Miller 358. 4: nearo fæsten micel ungefēredra mōra
 Plummer 1. 270. 5-6: in arduis asperisque montibus
 Miller 364. 4-5: in hēaum mōrum ond in rēðum

Compare also, from the Bible:

Ps. 74. (75.) 6: a desertis montibus
 of þissum wēstum wīdum mōrum

It is noteworthy that in the Lindisfarne Gospels (see my *Glossary*), *mons*, with two exceptions only, is translated by *mōr*. Everything considered, then, the equation of *mōr* and *mons* would appear to have prevailed in Northumbria.

As to *dēapscua* = *umbra mortis*, we may note that the normal sense of the Hebrew original (see Brown, Driver, and Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon*, p. 853) is deep shadow, darkness. In Jer. 13. 16, this is figuratively applied to distress, as also in Ps. 107. 10, 14; Isa. 9. 1. The New Testament instances are Matt. 4. 16; Lk. 1. 79 (from Isa. 9. 1), where *shadow of death* means thick darkness, and, figuratively, the darkness of ignorance and sin. In Old English poetry there is a tendency, as here, to personalize the shadow of death. In my edition of *Christ*, I emended the *dēor dēadscua* of 257 to *deorc dēadscua*, and commented on it as follows: "It is the personified Shadow of Death, a sublime conception. Imagine Milton's description of Death, *P. L.* 2. 666-673, applied to Satan." Perhaps the destruction of Grendel may thus symbolize the overthrow of Satan and his power of darkness (see Klaeber's edition, p. li).

ALBERT STANBURROUGH COOK.

Yale University.

REVIEWS

The Elizabethan Stage. By E. K. CHAMBERS. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1924. Four volumes.

In *The Nation* of August 27, 1924 the present reviewer published a brief notice of Mr. Chambers's admirable, important, and most useful work on the Elizabethan Stage. No apology is needed for recurring here to the same subject; indeed an absolutely adequate review could not be prepared without many months of preliminary investigation, for it would necessitate the checking over of multitudinous references and the testing of many hypotheses and inferences. Students in our various seminaries in English literature will gradually accomplish this work as they continue to make constant use of an indispensable book. Meanwhile a brief report upon the scope, method, and limitations of Mr. Chambers's work is in order.

The author's reputation is in itself a guarantee of patient exhaustive effort and substantial accuracy. He has unearthed but few new documents or new "facts"; but he has gathered together from many sources and in convenient orderly form a vast amount of material needed for the proper understanding of the social and economic conditions in which the Elizabethan theatres flourished, of the status of the actors and authors, of the relation of author and theatre-manager and of these two to the book-seller, of the connection of the drama with the court, of the attempts at government regulation of the stage, and of many similar subjects. His text is subjected to the control of a long series of appendices in which the appropriate contemporary documents are collected together. He has compiled a very full Calendar of all plays, masks, and quasi-dramatic entertainments at court during the period from the accession of Elizabeth to the death of Shakespeare. His lists of dramatists, actors, theatres, and separate plays form a veritable encyclopaedia of reference which will not be superseded for a very long time, if ever. He has approached the much-debated subject of the structure of the Elizabethan stage from a new "angle."

Mr. Chambers begins his work with an account of those aspects of court-life in the reign of Elizabeth and the earlier years of James I which have a bearing upon the history of the stage. The

justification for selecting this point of departure rests not only in the fact that these two monarchs and their courts were patrons of prime importance but that very many of the documents from which the stage-history can be reconstructed are court records. Unavoidably, however, the plan elected tends to give undue emphasis to the courtly side of dramatic entertainment at the expense of the popular side. This is a serious drawback, for the Elizabethan drama, for all the interest in it taken by the court, is essentially a popular form of art, closely connected with the life, the interests, and the ideas of the common people. Mr. Chambers, relying too cautiously upon the clearest and most authoritative records, fails to make this manifest.

The account of the royal household leads naturally to a similar study of the office of the revels, supplemented in appendices by the records of payments for entertainments and by the aforesaid Calendar. Thence Mr. Chambers passes to the subject of pageantry and the mask; and then, with no very logical connection, to "Humanism and Puritanism," an excellent summary of the several phases of the struggle which led in 1642 to the closing of the theatres. The disadvantages inherent in the author's self-imposed limitations as to date are especially apparent in this section of his work, for the story of the Puritan attack upon the stage breaks off long before its climax. The subject leads naturally to a narrative of the government's attempt to control the theatres and to exercise a censorship. Clear and orderly as this account is, it adds little to what Professor Thorndike and Dean Gildersleeve have already published upon the subject. The appendix (D) which accompanies this chapter is, however, enormously useful, for it is a summary with long *verbatim* extracts, of the "Documents of Control."

For all his meticulous dependence upon records Mr. Chambers finds pleasure (as readers of his classical work on *The Mediaeval Stage* will recall) in the humane and picturesque aspects of his delightful theme. The almost overwhelming abundance of his material here obliges him to lay a severe rein upon this inclination; but in the chapter on "The Actor's Quality" (*i. e.* upon the social and financial status of the professional actor) it is obvious that with larger space Mr. Chambers would willingly have treated the personal and picturesque sides of the subject at greater length. With this fine chapter his first volume closes.

The second volume deals with the theatres and theatrical companies, the history of each being epitomized in turn; and it contains also a list of actors alphabetically arranged with all the available biographical data and records of their connection with the several companies of players. A portion of volume III and a small part of volume IV contain lists of plays, arranged under the author's name where the author is known or else grouped together as anonymous; in these lists the facts with regard to the stage history and the publication of each play are assembled. Problems of sources, technique, motives and the like lie beyond Mr. Chambers's scope. The remainder of the final volume is occupied with the appendices. I return to volume III to note that it is concerned largely with the problem of the Elizabethan stage. Mr. Chambers's distinctive contribution to this much-debated question is his adherence to the "historical method" of inquiry, with a consequent abandonment of the traditional manner of dealing with the subject, namely, by the attempted reconstruction of a "typical" Elizabethan stage. He holds it unwise to start with the assumption that any such "typical" stage is conceivable in an investigation "which covers the practices of thirty or forty playing companies, in a score of theatres, over a period of not much less than a century." In view of the constant shifting of companies and plays from one theatre to another he is ready to admit that some "standardization of effects" (in Mr. Archer's phrase) probably took place; but similar "effects" might well have been produced by very dissimilar arrangements. He urges the probability that "a considerable evolution in the capacities of stage management" took place between the beginning and the close of the period with which he deals. And he begins his inquiry with an examination of court performances. This theme at once leads him to study the Italian influence upon the structure of the English stage, and he stresses the importance of Serlio's *Trattato sopra le Scene*, of which long extracts with illustrations are provided in Appendix G. In his chapters on the popular theatres Mr. Chambers makes a not altogether clear division at the turn of the century. Indisputably there are new characteristics that appear about the time of the accession of James I, but the distinctions from the characteristics of the fifteen-nineties are not very well defined. Mr. Chambers rightly uses the De Witt drawing as the prime, and only strictly contemporary,

authority upon which to base any discussion. He recognizes the entirely secondary importance of the late title-pages upon which are engraved minute representations of the interior of theatres. Mr. Chambers's chapters are bound to stimulate new study and discussion of this archaeological problem; in fact the late Mr. William Archer (in *The Quarterly Review*, No. 479, April 1924, pp. 399 f.) has already essayed a rejoinder.

Criticism of the arbitrary terminus adopted by Mr. Chambers, beyond which he has not carried his researches, is in a measure forestalled by the author's prefatory expression of regret for the "long since irretrievable" decision not to carry his investigations beyond the date of Shakespeare's death. His book therefore ends abruptly at the fortuitous date, April 23, 1616, thus leaving many of the collections of data incomplete and quite as disconcertingly printing the earliest items of many other collections the main body of which date from a later period. How inconvenient this is may be seen by consulting the lists of dramatists, *sub, e. g.*, Beaumont, Fletcher, or Massinger.

Mr. Chambers nearly always distinguishes between recorded fact and inferences and hypotheses drawn from these facts. The warning must, however, be given that occasionally he fails to indicate this distinction, and in various parts of his work the reader must proceed with caution. This is especially the case when the subject is so delicate and complicated as, for example, the problem of the merging of one dramatic company into another; the identification of lost plays or plays perhaps still in existence but known under another name than that which they bear in old records; and the connection of the individual dramatists with the different companies. Repeated tests have given me a high degree of confidence in Mr. Chambers's general accuracy; but his book is not so impeccable as some reviewers have rashly declared. A number of important articles and monographs are not recorded. Thus, F. W. Moorman's chapter in *The Cambridge History of English Literature* (v, x) on the plays attributed to Shakespeare should have been included in the list in volume III, p. 203. There is no mention of important dissertations by Herbst and Sinning dealing with *Cupid's Revenge* (III, 225); nor those by Reinhold and Ebert on the *Four Plays in One* (III, 231). Professor E. E. Stoll's treatise on *Hamlet* (*Publications of the University of Minnesota*, VIII, No. 5)

is not listed among the authorities on the "Ur-Hamlet" (III, 397). Other articles by Dr. Stoll are also omitted. Knowledge of Professor Hillebrand's article on "The Children of the King's Revels at Whitefriars" (*Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, April, 1922) would have enabled Mr. Chambers to supplement his account of this company (II, 64 f.). The Pearson edition of *Edward the Fourth* is not recorded (IV, 10). *The True Tragedy of Richard the Third* is reprinted in the Furness *Variorum* (IV, 43). There are some positive misstatements. Mr. Chambers says (III, 216) that "in 1647 and 1679 the actors and publishers issued collections of fifty-three pieces" (by Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger). But the First Folio (1647) contained only those plays that had not previously appeared in quarto; and the Second Folio (1679) contains fifty-two, not fifty-three, pieces. *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* is probably not an "independent" Beaumont play (III, 217); it is generally believed that the Jasper-Luce scenes contain matter by Fletcher. *The Faithful Friends* should of course not be listed under Lost Plays (IV, 400). *The Second Maiden's Tragedy* is listed as lost with the curious contradictory note that it is "extant in MS" (IV, 402). As a matter of fact it was first printed in *The Old English Drama* (1825; volume 1), and is reprinted in Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, volume x. Nor should *The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom* be set down as lost (IV, 402). Four, not three, plays (IV, 404) in the Egerton MS. 1994 date before 1616. Mr. Chambers has omitted (IV, 405) from his list of plays extant in MS. *Edmund Ironsides*, which is one of the pieces in Egerton 1994. He includes in this list of Manuscript Plays another in the same collection which he calls *I Richard II* (IV, 405). Eleven copies of this tedious piece were printed long ago by Halliwell-Phillipps. In the MS. it bears no title. It may be added that since Mr. Chambers's work was put into type the manuscript of *John a Kent and John a Cumber* (IV, 405), which he records as in the collection of Lord Mostyn, has changed hands. See Quaritch's Sale Catalogue, No. 380 (December 1923), item 135.

SAMUEL C. CHEW.

Bryn Mawr College.

Märchen des Mittelalters von ALBERT WESSELSKI. Berlin: Herbert Stubenrauch, 1925. xxiii, 271 pp.

In 1909 Wesselski published at Leipzig a handsome volume with the somewhat misleading title of *Mönchslatein, Erzählungen aus geistlichen Schriften des XIII. Jahrhunderts*. In it the author gave a German translation of one hundred and fifty-four *exempla*, from various sources. The principal stress was laid upon anecdotes and jests, and the extensive notes dealt largely with the diffusion of this class of literature.

In the new work, beautifully printed by Herbert Stubenrauch, the author presents to the public a new collection of sixty-six stories from the following sources: Bromyard (No. 41), Caesarius of Heisterbach (No. 33), Thomas Cantipratanus (No. 55), *Compilatio singularis exemplorum*, ed. Hilka (Nos. 7, 15, 19, 25, 26, 32, 40, 43, 46, 56), Konrad Derrer's *Geschichtenbuch* (Nos. 31, 36, 59, 60), *Disciplina clericalis* (No. 2, 62), *Historia septem Sapientum* (Nos. 29, 48, 64), *Erzählungen aus altdeutschen Handschriften*, ed. A. v. Keller (No. 3), *Erzählungen des Mittelalters*, ed. Klapper (No. 51), Étienne de Bourbon (No. 52), *Gesta Romanorum* (Nos. 13, 18, 21, 44, 47, 57), Harley ms. 3241, Brit. Mus. (No. 66), *Islendzk Aeventyri* (No. 17), Wright's *Latin Stories* (Nos. 11, 61), *Liber Exemplorum*, ed. A. J. Little (No. 9), Juan Manuel (Nos. 16, 24, 49, 63), *Nouveau recueil de Contes*, ed. Jubinal (No. 45), *Novelle antiche* (Nos. 12, 23, 30, 34, 39, 50, 65), Pelbart (Nos. 6, 14, 42), *Predigtmärlein*, ed. Pfeffer (No. 5), Romulus (No. 58), Solomon and Marcolfus (No. 8), *Scala Celi* (Nos. 10, 20, 28, 35), Giov. Sercambi (Nos. 1, 27, 37), *Toldoth Jeschua* (No. 22), *Jacques de Vitry* (Nos. 4, 33, 38, 54).

Among the well known stories represented in the collection are: Vengeance deferred (No. 9), Maiden without Hands (No. 10), The Thankful Dead (No. 12), Two Travellers (No. 14), Godfather Death (No. 17), The Three Caskets (No. 18), The Three Clever Brothers (No. 20), Taming of the Shrew (No. 24), Water of Life (No. 28), Robber and his Sons (No. 29), Three Magic Objects: Ring, Brooch, Carpet (No. 44), Placidus (No. 47), Father sheltered (No. 48), Proud King (No. 49), Don Juan, the dead Guest (No. 51), Ungrateful Man, Grateful Beasts (No. 56), Abbot and Shepherd (No. 60), Pound of Flesh (No. 61).

The notes to the individual stories, "Zur Geschichte und Verbreitung der Märchen," fill eighty pages and are of the greatest interest and value. Some of these notes, for example those to Nos. 3, *Die Verschenkten Lebensjahre*; 14, *Die Wette um die Augen*, 37, *Scharfsinnsproben*, 61, *Das Fleischpfand*, and 66, *Der Glaube versetzt Berge* are almost of the dimension of essays. The nature of these notes will be better understood after an examination of the preface, pp. xi-xxiii.

Wesselski begins at once with an attack on the Finnish school of *märchen*-investigation.¹ He says: "the wider and deeper the influence of the Finnish school of *märchen*-investigation penetrates, the greater is the triumph of the so-called folk *märchen* over the so-called literary *märchen*. While one values a tale taken down from the mouth of a Gypsy, provided it is quite evidently not distorted, as a conclusive document, one considers a brief story written down by some mediaeval preacher as only an artificial product, a mixture deliberately put together, in which not only each element as to its veracity and originality, but in addition the way and manner of their combination must be proved by their agreement with the vagrant phantom, and at best the result of this examination is that by further investigation the version which for centuries has belonged to literature is placed on the same level with the traditional form narrated in a parish of the far north."

Wesselski continues his attack by a reference to the story of "The Two Travellers" (Grimm, No. 107), which he gives in a version of Oswald Pelbart, a Franciscan preacher of the end of the fifteenth century. He says, p. xii, "This *märchen* has not been chosen without design as an example. It is one of the few *märchen* to which the Finnish method of investigation has been literally applied. The results of this investigation are, as one can convince himself from our note to Pelbart's *märchen*, entirely false.

¹ I have examined this method at length in my notice of the *F. F. Communications* in the *Romanic Review*, vol. VII, pp. 118, *et seq.*; one of the *Communications*, No. 24, containing Christiansen's monograph on "The Two Travellers" (Grimm, No. 107), I have treated in the *Romanic Review*, *ut supra*, pp. 189, *et seq.* Wesselski lays particular stress on this in his preface, pp. xi-xii, and, at greater length, in his notes to No. 14, "Die Wette um die Augen," pp. 203, *et seq.*

Of course the fault is probably the superficiality and carelessness of the investigator, but the chief fault lies in the views on which the method is based."

The investigator who is so harshly judged is Christiansen, the above-mentioned author of an admirable monograph on this story in No. 24 of the *F. F. Communications*, whose conclusion briefly is that the earliest form of the tale is found in India and harmonizes best with the whole tale-milieu there. He concludes that the tale came to Europe partly in a literary form, and partly in an oral tradition, the former passing through Southern Europe where it has become the familiar type, the latter passing through the Slavonic world on its way westward.

Wesselski's conclusion, p. 208, is that the *märchen* may have arisen somewhat as follows: a feature originally Indian—good and bad brother, blinding of the good by the bad, restoration of the sight of the good brother by a just fate—has in its wandering from literature to literature lost on the one hand the single trait, that the actors in the story are brothers; on the other hand has taken up the union of two features unknown in India—overhearing and failure of imitation. The one who first carried through this amalgum may have been a Jew (see the Hebrew apologue of the Jew and the heathen),² who learned the rest perhaps from a Persian-Arabian intermediary—unfortunately no intermediate link has yet been discovered which would substantially support this view.

Wesselski's selections (as is also the case in his former work) are almost exclusively of a literary character, as distinguished from the so-called folk-tale, or *märchen*, as it is generally termed. Wesselski sees no difference in these and declares, p. xxii, that every new discovery gives a fresh proof that the *märchen* follows the same laws as all other literature. This is clear, he remarks, also

² The apologue here mentioned is cited on p. 204, from M. Gaster, *Folklore*, VII, 231: A Jew and a heathen wager as to which is the better man. Satan in various shapes pronounces the heathen the better. The Jew, penniless, sleeps out in the open air and overhears the talk of three demons. He learns from it how he has been deceived, how the emperor's daughter cannot give birth to her child and what must be done to make a spring bring forth water again. The Jew becomes rich by the knowledge of these secrets. The heathen who imitates the Jew's actions is killed by the demons.

from the study of the *märchen* of our own past. Aarne himself considers the middle ages as one of the epochs which produced an especially large number of *märchen*, and thinks that future investigation will probably show that many European *märchen* are mediaeval. Wesselski adds, that when Aarne wrote this the first volume only of Bolte and Polívka's notes to Grimm had appeared, and this acknowledgment is based upon the enormous amount of material there amassed. The later volumes show by many proofs what a treasure of the long despised *märchen* fund is to be dug out in the writings of those by gone times.

The writer of this review has long been convinced of the futility of classification in this field, and believes that so far as the question of diffusion is concerned there is no difference between *märchen* and *schwänke*. As to the materials of these stories and their origin it is not so clear and Wesselski's remarks on this topic in his preface, pp. xiv *et seq.*, are worth careful consideration. Apparently he considers the incidents in folk tales to have arisen naturally out of the various relations of human life, modified later by the traditional memories of earlier stages of civilization. The diffusion of tales already formed he ascribes to converts and immigrants, including slaves in the Orient and in the Europe of early mediaeval days. Soldiers and traders were more influential than ecclesiastics who were hampered by their religious views. Perhaps it will appear that among the traders it was the Jew who brought the most from the land of classical story-telling to the Occident and left here and there as a recompense one of the tales familiar to him.

So after all it is to Benfey that we must return!

T. F. CRANE.

Cornell University.

RECENT FRENCH TEXT BOOKS

One is tempted, after looking through some of the recently published grammars, to agree with Pierre Nozière when he asks: "A quoi bon ajouter à tout ce papier noirci quelques pages encore? Il serait meilleur de ne point écrire." There seems no reason for publishing, for instance, such a grammar as the *Advanced French*

Grammar, a Lexicologic, Syntactic, Philologic and Literary Finishing Course for Colleges and Scholars, by Ch. M. Marchand, Honorary Instructor in the French Language, Paris and the United States."¹ One is ready to be impressed. One is, but not in the way the author intended. The book is an undigested collection of facts and near-facts, put together with very little system, and with no index to guide one through the labyrinth. If one ever desired to utilize some of the information given, such as, for example, "suffixes désignant les habitants des villes de France," it would be much easier to turn to the *Petit Larousse* where one would find in less time what one desired. In the concluding words of the preface, the author modestly informs us that "this important treatise may be profitably consulted for grammatical researches and as a literary guide." One can dismiss the last contention in a word by saying that he mentions Voltaire and André Chénier as belonging to the Renaissance (p. 435). Whether the work may be consulted for grammatical researches, the reader can judge for himself. We find the following bit of wisdom at the head of the second chapter: "The gender of French nouns is the main cause for the agreement of articles, adjectives, pronouns and participles." Again (p. 58): "The definite article *le, la, les*, comes before every general noun used alone, contrary to the English usage, as it is the only way to recognize its gender and number." It would be interesting to learn how *les* indicates gender. Again (p. 59): "The definite article is not repeated before the second of two adjectives joined by *et*, referring to the same noun, as in English." He manifestly says one thing and means another. There are other similar examples of faulty English which the collaborator, who is an American, should have corrected. For example (p. 60): "The definite article is used with the names of some famous artists, as it is done in the Italian language," "the present indicative comes with *si*" (p. 201); instead of 'aquarella' (p. 68) English employs 'water-color' as an equivalent of 'aquarelle.' To these one can add examples of faulty French such as the following from which it would seem that there are six conjugations: "Le participe revêt des terminaisons différentes selon les diverses conjugaisons: parlé, fini, reçu, offert, écrit, mis" (p. 268). There are many misstatements of grammatical principles of which space permits giving only a few.

¹ Brentano's.

On page 73 we find: "If the adverb of quantity is restricted by a relative clause, the partitive is used," and his examples show plainly that there is no partitive idea at all: "J'ai lu beaucoup des livres que vous m'avez prêtés." The article is used here because it particularizes the noun, as is the case in all the examples cited as exceptions on page 74 and 75. He is wrong in stating (p. 74) that general negations require only *de* instead of a partitive; that the feminine form 'hébreue' is used in speaking of women (p. 110); that 'un bonhomme' means a simpleton (p. 122); that 'prochain' refers only to time (p. 136); that disjunctive pronouns are used after all prepositions except *à* (p. 143); that 'penser' takes *à* instead of *de* (p. 147); that *l'on* never begins a sentence (p. 173); that subject pronouns always follow the verb after 'aussi' (p. 179); that 'know how' is 'savoir comment' (p. 225); that there is any distinction between 'commencer à' and 'commencer de' (p. 233); that 'vouloir dire' is used only when the subject is a person (p. 255); that 'déranger' is used for persons exclusively (p. 376); that 'casuel' is the pay of *le petit commerçant* (p. 368) (it is used for the clergy); that 'plus' is used only between the terms of a comparison and may not end a sentence (p. 290); that *ne . . . que* is negative (p. 290); that "est-ce que vous parlez bien le français?" means "Is it so that you speak French well?" (p. 177); that there is any certainty in "croyez-vous qu'il pleuvra" or "je ne crois pas qu'il pleuvra" (p. 211); that "reflexive verbs are those in which the subject and direct object are the same person doing and receiving the action"—(*ils se sont lavé les mains* would not then be reflexive); that *moi* and *toi* become *me* and *te* before *y* and *en* "in order to avoid hiatus" (p. 146) (it is because tonic forms are not used in atonic position); that nationality is a physical quality (p. 121); that the chapter heading "Epineux Cas de Syntaxe" is as good French as "Cas de Syntaxe Epineux." In many places throughout the book (p. 146, 150, etc.) more prominence is given to the wrong forms than to the right. This is bad pedagogy. There are exercises at the end of each chapter—English sentences to be translated into French—which are of the degree of difficulty usually found in elementary grammars. Another section comprises "Vieux textes français" which are to be put into modern French after referring to a four-page glossary of Old French at the back of the book. That is bad enough, but there is next

encountered a section called 'Exercice oral' in which one is to reply in French to questions like the following: "La morale naturelle peut-elle remplacer la morale religieuse? Donner quelques-uns des 30 noms servant à désigner les profits du labeur. Donnez le plus possible de 73 mots composant la famille de *lire*, des 90 formant celle de *poser*." There are several misprints: (p. 56) for 'Français,' read français; (p. 80) for 'evitées,' read évitées; (p. 199) for 'diner,' read dîner; (p. 201) for 'dinerons,' read dînerons; (p. 208 for § 751, read § 753; (p. 278) for 'le peu de salade qui j'ai mangée,' read 'que'; (p. 391) for 'Monte-di-Pieta,' read Monte-di-Pietà; (p. 406) for 'ou médit,' read on médit; (p. 435) for 'Sédaine,' read Sedaine; (p. 440) for 'Grébon,' read Gréban.

Another grammar which cannot be recommended² is a book resulting from the teaching of officers and soldiers during the war. It does not lend itself to use in schools or colleges, for there are no exercises, no divisions into lessons, no vocabulary, no index. There are long word lists which are impedimenta. There are many misstatements regarding the grammatical material. *Y* and *en*, for example, are not relative pronouns, nor are reflexive verbs those "of which the subject and the object are the same" (p. 58), nor does the subjunctive express a fact (p. 64) nor is "il me faut aller" considered good French.

Another book to be censured for employing word-lists to excess³ is a beginning book for students in French—a combined grammar and reader prepared for high school pupils. It is too elementary for college use; the tone of the book is childish at times, even for high school pupils. Most of the illustrations portray children of nine or ten years of age, and the inclusion of songs is unnecessary. Of what interest is it to anyone to have starred in the vocabularies the words which are in the list prepared by the New York Society for the Experimental Study of Education? There is no phonetic transcription, but plenty of drill in pronunciation in each lesson, an element which is commendable, although there is too much grammatical material in each lesson. The book is carefully printed. It should be noted, however, that the accent is rarely written in French over capital A, as the author consistently writes it through-

² Catherine J. P. Hill, *Essentials of Practical French*, Cornhill Publishing Company.

³ Lawrence A. Wilkins, *First French Book*, Holt and Company.

out the book, nor is the accent written over the capital *I* in *île*; the French would write "des îles Vierges" (p. 184). It is a matter of personal conviction whether or not the rules of grammar should be given in French; it seems that better results are obtained if one is sure that the student thoroughly understands the rules and does not merely learn them parrot-like as is apt to be the case if they are given in French. On the whole, the rules are clearly stated. It is not correct, however, to say (p. 97): "When the partitive noun follows a negative, *de* alone expresses *some* or *any*." In the first place, when would *some* be used in a negative sentence in English? In the second place, the rule does not cover such cases as "Nous ne sommes pas des juges," nor is it consistent with the statement (p. 98) that *ne . . . que* is negative, and that one would say: "ce ne sont que des perles." Of course, *ne . . . que* is not negative. The statement regarding the employment of the dieresis in such words as 'aiguë' is not clear, nor can 'mes papiers' (p. 60) be called singular. There are occasional slips from good French. One does not say (p. 23): "Ils venaient souvent nous visiter," for one does not 'visiter' a person. I never heard a Frenchman call a taxi a 'taximètre,' nor is it good French to say (p. 155): "J'ai payé sept dollars pour les souliers." No Frenchman would say: "Je demeure dans la rue La Fayette" and I question whether he would say: "Qu'est-ce que c'est que ceci." No subjunctive is employed, nor are the forms given. There is no special arrangement; grammatical principles are mentioned as they occur in the French texts selected.

There have recently been published two books employing the direct method (the latter complete in itself and including those matters dealt with in Book I). The material in both books is well presented; the rules, given in French, are clearly stated. Both volumes⁴ can be criticized for employing too extensive vocabularies in the lessons. Many of the words given occur very rarely. How frequently would one have occasion, for example, to refer to one's 'annulaire' or one's 'auriculaire'? Another matter which is pernicious is the endeavor to approximate the sound of French vowels and consonants by way of the nearest English equivalent. Is it to be expected that the student by pronouncing 'yank' will know how

⁴ G. P. Fougeray, *The Mastery of French*, Direct Method, Books I and II, Iroquois Publishing Company.

to pronounce 'pain' (p. xxii), or in fact that any of the nasal or mixed vowels can be approached in this manner? The rule for the agreement of the past participle is wrongly stated in both books (ii, p. 86): "Il s'accorde toujours avec le sujet quand il est conjugué avec être," wherein no mention is made of reflexive verbs. The last half of Book II abandons the direct method and becomes a reference grammar, giving lists of the commoner idioms, which are useful. At the back of both books are lists of words employed in each lesson. It may be beneficial to furnish groups of words having a certain connection, but the general practice of employing word-lists seems unsatisfactory.

The *Elementary French Grammar*, by Professors McKenzie and Hamilton⁶ is an attractively printed grammar, illustrated with pictures of young people of college age. The book is so simplified that it ought to be very easy for the average student. All exceptions are disregarded, and although many of the commoner French idioms and grammatical points are omitted, the essentials are given, and in general, very succinctly and clearly stated. The misstatement is again made that "some or any is expressed by *de* alone if the phrase is negative" (p. 52). Nothing is said (p. 147) of the use of 'celui.' If 'comparative degree' is defined (p. 17) as "indicating that one thing has more of a quality than another," how can the comparative of an adverb be formed by placing 'aussi' before it (p. 178)? The lessons seem too simple for college students, especially in the first half of the book, but maybe it is better to be sure of having a limited knowledge of the grammar well assimilated, than to endeavor to cover too much ground. Perhaps one reason for the simplicity is found expressed in the exercise on page 206: "Nous sommes de l'ouest, et nous aimons mieux une Université de l'ouest! Je ne sais pas, mais j'aurais peut-être mieux fait d'aller à Harvard; j'aurais beaucoup plus étudié là où il n'y a pas tant de jeunes filles!" The lessons deal with every-day subjects which ought to be interesting to the students. It is satisfying to see that *ne . . . que* is not called negative. Inasmuch as many students enter college with no adequate idea of English grammar, it is a good idea to give, as is here done, the definition of the parts of speech at the beginning of the book. Why then do the authors try to make a proper noun out of the common noun 'university,'

⁶ The Century Company.

writing it with a capital U throughout, and likewise 'Professors' with a capital P? There are a few misprints. In defining an impersonal verb (p. 18), read 'third person singular'; for 'adjourd'hui' (p. 117), read 'aujourd'hui'; for 'pouquoi' (p. 117), read 'pourquoi'; for 'ertain' (p. 177), read 'certain'; for 'quevou s' (p. 223), read 'que vous'; for 'abstract nouns in -tie' (p. 248), read '-tié.' *ô* is perhaps purposely represented throughout by *ô*, but why depart from accepted usage?

*A Travers la France*⁶ is primarily a collection of *morceaux choisis*, selected as representative of the best in modern French thought. These texts are preceded by a diary, written in French, of a young American who visits France. It is rather puzzling to know how such a book might be employed, for although there are cross-references between the two parts, the connection seems rather artificial. It seems impossible to gain in a selection of a page or two an adequate idea of any author as diversified as Anatole France or Balzac, no matter how representative the chosen passage may be. The biographical notices, especially in the case of such writers as Hugo, Maupassant, Balzac, and others, are of no great value. One wonders at the exclusion of Alphonse Daudet. It is strange to speak of 'la présente guerre' in a book dated 1923. The father of Anatole France was not one of the "bouquinistes des quais" (p. 71), but a *libraire* on the Quai Voltaire. The book would probably be helpful to someone with a limited knowledge of modern authors, who desired to acquaint himself with recent French thought.

There has recently appeared a combined reader and composition book to be used in beginning classes.⁷ The topics treated should be interesting to the average student and the vocabulary seems adequate (although there is no phonetic transcription). There are a few matters that can be corrected in the next edition. The past definite should not be used in questions (cf. p. 184, 188, 190, etc.). The capital *A* throughout the book is written with the accent, contrary to French usage; the student would look in vain in the vocabulary for help in saying "pass an examination." The usual

⁶ *A Travers la France, choix de textes précédé du journal de voyage d'un étudiant américain, par Félix Bertaut et Hélène Harvitt*, Oxford University Press.

⁷ Eugène F. Maloubier, *Au Jour le Jour*, Heath and Company.

version regarding Ponce de Leon (p. 80) is that he did not find the spring of youth. Unusual words and expressions such as 'prendre froid,' 'peu s'en faut que,' 'de-ci de-là,' 'de vive voix' might be avoided, also the boston and quadrille sound rather antiquated (p. 58).

Two collections of stories by recent French writers⁸ are worthy of mention. The first is too difficult to be used before the last part of the second year, and some of the stories are too sentimental. The vocabulary and notes of both are adequate, although both define 'pourpre' as 'purple.'

RALPH C. WILLIAMS.

Johns Hopkins University.

Festschrift für Konrad Zwierzina (zum 29. März 1924). Graz, Wien, Leipzig: Verlag Leuschner und Lubensky, 1924:

JELLINEK, M. H., *Otfrids grammatische und metrische Bemerkungen*. 16 pp. M. 0.80.

KRAUS, C. VON, *Zu Walthers Elegie* (124, 1-125, 10). 13 pp. M. 0.80.

SINGER, S., *Ruodlieb*. 23 pp. M. 0.80.

The above three titles constitute a *Festschrift* for Konrad Zwierzina on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday. A fourth greeting from Professor Seuffert, not technically a part of this volume and concerned also with a problem in a more modern field, will receive separate consideration in a later issue. Of a memorial volume dealing with Old German studies no one certainly was more worthy than Zwierzina, whose notable series of *Mittelhochdeutsche Studien* especially (*ZfdA.* 44 and 45) not only settled definitely numberless disputed points in Middle High German grammatical usage but blazed new paths in the matter of methodology as well. If this volume has in size and appearance none of the sumptuousness of such publications in the Reich, this is readily explained by the difficulties with which life in the Old Austria is, financially, beset.

⁸ Régis Michaud, *Conteurs français d'aujourd'hui*, Heath and Company, and *Stories by Contemporary French Novelists*, ed. by Marion E. Bowler, Ginn and Company.

Jellinek, as the historian of German grammar, deals with Otfrid's remarks on grammar and metrics in the Preface "Ad Liutbertum." In Zwierzina's doctoral dissertation (1886) and in his first printed article (*ZfdA.* 31, 292-297) the same general topic, the points of contact between Otfrid's observations and the terminology and statements of Latin grammarians, received treatment. Jellinek's article supplements these older studies of Zwierzina. Basing largely on a recent Königsberg dissertation of W. O. Neumann, *De barbarismo et metaplasmo quid Romani docuerint* (1917), he discusses the provenience and meanings of the term "metaplasmus." A number of correspondences are shown to exist between Otfrid and the Latin grammarian Donatus, and these observations are further fortified by tracing, very plausibly, an incorrect "videbatur ascribi" (Erdmann, line 63) to a wholly correct "adscribi" of Donatus. Of particular interest are Jellinek's statements concerning the system of punctuation found in the Vienna ms. of Otfrid, and toward the end of the article, where he leaves the subject of Otfrid's Preface, on the subject of the elision of inflectional *-e* in adjectives in Opitz. On the latter subject he takes sharp issue with the conclusions arrived at by Baesecke.

Kraus's contribution is a discussion of the metrical form of Walther von der Vogelweide's *Elegie* (Lachmann 124, 1-125, 10). Applying the same acribi to the metrical problem that has distinguished his studies in the field of Middle High German grammatical usage, he arrives at the conclusion that the poem originally had the rhythm of the Nibelungen line. While eleven of the forty-eight verses do not as handed down respond to this interpretation, Kraus eliminates five of these as clearly showing faulty scribal transmission.¹ The proportion that the six lines not yielding to corrective treatment represent of the entire number of lines under consideration is then shown to be far smaller than in the case of other poems of Walther when an attempt is made to force six-beat lines with masculine ending into the jacket of the Nibelungen verse form. The disproportion is, in fact, found to be almost

¹ It is not altogether clear why 1, 7 is emended on page 7 but listed on page 12 as one of six cases left unexplained. Note 7 on this latter page repeats the list of page 8 but adds 1, 7.

that between $1/2$ and $1/7$. An explanation of the corrupt state of the text is found in the hypothesis that the present form is due to a conscious attempt to revise the Nibelungen lines into six-beat lines with alternating rhythm. A rather interesting generalization concludes the paper. The Kürenberg strophe, says Kraus, started in Austria as a lyric measure. The Austrian poet of the Nibelungen employed it as an epic stanza; but the Austrian Walther, changing the form, brought it back to the lyric sphere. Such is the cycle of life in art as well.

In his *Ruodlieb* Professor Singer of Bern rather startlingly takes us to the market-place of a Rhenish city where a Bavarian cleric is watching what purports to be the eleventh century counterpart of the modern variété. The scenes enacted on the improvised stage of the market place make a most colorful picture and it is all so vividly drawn that one sees it go on before one's eyes. The purpose is to show, by a synthesis, how such a complex as the *Ruodlieb* might be conceived as having arisen. The synthesis of Part I is followed by an analysis in Part II, in which an attempt is made to trace the widely ramified connections of the *Ruodlieb* story. The drop from the vivid narrative of the first part to the matter-of-fact *Gelehrtenstil* of the second half comes, to be sure, with somewhat of a shock.

The opening situation is shown to be typical of the *chanson de geste* and parallels are pointed out with the epic of *Isembard and Gormond* as handed down to us in *Loher and Maller*, a fifteenth century German translation of a prose version. The French *Gormon et Isembart* is known to have existed as early as 1088. Singer's thesis assumes that it existed at least fifty years earlier, and he would urge this very parallelism with *Ruodlieb* as an argument for so early a date. It furnishes, in fact, the earliest date for an example of the transference of an epic motif from France to Germany. The parallels presented by Singer are certainly very striking. Illuminating also are the remarks on the herb *buglossa* (for these a Strassburg dissertation by Rosenthaler is drawn upon) as an aid in fishing and the hunting of wolves. It is conclusively shown that these stories are not mere fables but rest on facts in natural history, reflected even now in existent plant names.

Indiana University.

B. J. Vos.

Les Langues du Monde, par un groupe de linguistes sous la direction de A. MEILLET et MARCEL COHEN (Collection Linguistique publiée par la Société Linguistique de Paris, XVI; Paris, Librairie Ancienne Edouard Champion, 1924. 811 pp., 18 plates of maps).

To the tireless energies of Prof. A. Meillet, the distinguished Indo-Europeanist, we owe this admirable review of the languages of the world. The work could hardly have been undertaken except as here planned and carried out, that is, by a number of linguistic specialists. It is true that works of a similar nature, such as Friedrich Müller's *Grundriss der Sprachwissenschaft* and A. Trombetti's *Elementi di Glottologia*, have been written by individual scholars, but, on the whole, it was probably wise to sacrifice something of unity of treatment to the greater authoritativeness that was bound to result from a division of labor.

The parts into which the book falls are: an Introduction, by A. Meillet; Indo-European, by J. Vendryes; Hamito-Semitic, by Marcel Cohen (it is with great satisfaction that one sees a conservative book of this type recognizing the fundamental points of accord that have long been pointed out between Semitic and "Hamitic" to the point of frankly uniting them into a single genetic group); Finno-Ugrian and Samoyed, by A. Sauvageot; Turkish, Mongol, and Tungusic Languages, by J. Deny; Japanese; Korean; Ainu; "Hyperborean" Languages (i. e., Chukchee, Yukagir, and Gilyak), all four by S. Éliassév; Special Languages of the Ancient Near East (particularly Sumerian, Elamite, Hittite, Lydian, and Etruscan), by C. Autran; Basque, by George Lacombe; Northern Caucasian Languages, by N. Troubetzkoy; Southern Caucasian Languages, by A. Meillet; Dravidian, by Jules Bloch; Sino-Tibetan, by J. Przyluski (this term is much to be preferred to the misleading "Indo-Chinese" that has been current; "Sinic" is perhaps even better); Austroasiatic Languages (Mon-Khmer, Annamite, and Munḍā), by J. Przyluski; Malayo-Polynesian, by Gabriel Ferrand (Papuan Languages, which do not properly belong here, are briefly treated at the end of this section); Australian Languages, by A. Meillet; Languages of the Soudan and of Guinea, by Maurice Delafosse; Bantu, by Miss L. Homburger; Bushman and Hottentot, by Miss L. Homburger;

and American Languages, by P. Rivet. There is an adequate equipment of bibliographies and maps and an excellent index. All in all, the book is an achievement and no serious student of general linguistics or descriptive anthropology can afford to do without it. That it will need to be replaced by another work of similar scope in a few decades goes without saying (certain of its paragraphs became antiquated in the writing!) but for the present it is indispensable.

Just because this work is so precious for the linguist it will not seem ungracious if we point out certain shortcomings. In the first place a number of important languages have slipped out from under the specialists. The editors and their staff will be chagrined to discover that the Andaman group, which includes a considerable number of quite distinct dialects or languages, and the isolated Siberian group to which belong "Yenissei Ostyak" (to be carefully distinguished from the Ugro-Finnic "Ostyak" and from the "Ostyak" dialect of Samoyed) and Kott are entirely omitted. Both of these isolated families are treated in considerable detail in Trombetti's *Elementi* and both are of crucial importance for the early linguistic history of Asia. Trombetti produces some evidence, by no means to be despised, which tends to connect the Yenissei Ostyak group with Sino-Tibetan. A mere glance at F. N. Finck's useful little *Sprachstämme des Erdkreises* would have insured at least a mention of the two groups. A more excusable omission is that of Zandawe, a language recently discovered in east central Africa and showing unmistakable resemblances to the Bushman and Hottentot languages far to the south (see Trombetti). The historical importance of this language is obvious.

A second and probably more serious criticism is the lack of a consistent plan in the treatment of the various sections. Mechanical uniformity was rightly rejected by the editors, but they have gone to the opposite extreme. As it is, certain languages or groups of languages receive an altogether disproportionate share of attention. In some sections a good deal of useful information is given on the morphology of the languages listed, in others there is considerable detail of a bibliographical and geographical nature but no vitalizing hints as to the nature of the languages themselves, in still others a vast field is dismissed with a few perfunc-

tory remarks and a shrug of the shoulders. The editors cannot honestly retort that they have had to omit all grammatical discussion where none is given in the book because of the scantiness of the data. As a matter of fact, the descriptive material available in many such cases is of a very high order of merit. There would have been no more essential difficulty, for instance, in giving some elementary idea of Algonkin or Siouan or Athabaskan or Maya structure than of Hottentot or Polynesian structure and such indications would have added immeasurably to the value of the work, which now hovers uncertainly between the geographical listing of groups and sub-groups and the morphological discussion of languages. The ideal method would probably have been to combine the two, as in the admirable section on Hamito-Semitic, which could well have spared, on the other hand, a great deal of its rather irrelevant historical detail.

One other point. It was cruel to assign the vast field of American Indian languages to a single specialist. No one person living today could even begin to get his bearings in it, let alone do justice to it. It might have been necessary for the editors to go outside of France and to secure the coöperation of at least one specialist for North America north of Mexico and another for Mexico and Central America, leaving the South American field in the hands of M. Rivet, who is obviously the one best qualified to handle it. If it was the intention of the editors to show how well an essentially international task could be carried out with the splendid resources of French scholarship alone, all we can say is that they must be congratulated on coming as near solving an impossible task as it was reasonably possible to do.

E. SAPIR.

Ottawa, Ont.

William Dean Howells, A Study by OSCAR W. FIRKINS. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1924.

The substantial volume which Mr. Firkins has devoted to William Dean Howells is not a biography, though it begins with a chapter on his life; nor is it an appreciation, though it involves a careful estimate of his works from the least to the greatest, for

the evaluation is coolly objective and the "heart somehow seems all squeezed out by the mind." It is a thorough-going analysis of the personality of Howells and of his literary output. A glance at the structure of the book gives one a new sense of the versatility and the amazing industry of a long and placid life. A chapter entitled "Memories and Portraits" includes comment on seven more or less autobiographical books; another styled "Journeyings and Parleyings" deals with fifteen devoted to travel or to a blend of travel and fiction; thirty-one novels and nine tales or novelettes stretch Chapter IV into 170 pages; and there remain to be considered plays running beyond a score of titles, a rather thin output of verse, and a body of criticism best gauged by its range over forty-five authors and half a dozen languages. A chapter on the style of Howells, another on his humor, and a third which, briefly, hazards a few guesses as to his future fame complete the book. A bibliography, exhaustive as to works by Howells and generally suggestive as to critical comment upon him, is added as appendix.

The chief merit of Mr. Firkins's method is its completeness. His examination of the large and varied literary product of Howells is encyclopedic and his judgment is acute and stimulating, particularly in what is materially the most useful part of the book—the discussion of the novels. Completeness demanded an assay of the verse; but it is difficult to give assent even to the qualified praise of the hexameters and still less to follow the critic in his approval of the later poems. Howells has obvious limitations and none more conspicuous than his entire lack of lyric gift. In spite of Stedman's protest, his sole field was prose. The recent discovery of the Lanier letter to Edward Spencer which recounts the manner and the grounds of Howells's rejection of "Corn" for the "Atlantic" raises serious questions as to the editor's judgment of the lyric gift in others. A glance at the verse which he did accept for successive issues in the mid-seventies betrays a remarkable bluntness of perception in one whose claim to eminence as a critic is so well-founded.

With Howells's merits as a stylist and the consequent value of his works of autobiography and travel Mr. Firkins might be more sympathetic. A little unconcern about small jangles of diction or idioms is more than offset by a really remarkable power of quiet and sure simplicity of style, a simplicity all the more admirable

in contrast with the glittering smartness of the prose most in favor today.

In his estimate of the verdict of posterity Mr. Firkins is, wisely, very guarded. What the future will think of Howells is a matter about which prediction is exceptionally difficult. The matter which is beyond question is the present interest and significance of the broad region which he so quietly ruled as his demesne and the timely value of such a Baedeker for it as Mr. Firkins has provided.

The Johns Hopkins University.

JOHN C. FRENCH.

CORRESPONDENCE

OLD FRENCH *prendre a*, "TO BEGIN"

Throughout the Old French period the two verbs of beginning which recur constantly before a complementary infinitive are *comencier a* and *prendre a*.

Alquant le prenent fortment a blastengier

(*Alex.*, v. 317).

De guarnemenz se prent a cunreer

(*Rel.*, v. 343).

Par mi les rues les commence a guier

(*Charr. de Nymes*, v. 1164).

Ses nies Bertrans li commence a dire

(*Prise d'Orange*, v. 334).

These constructions first interested me because, strange to say, the pronoun object of the complementary infinitive does not here follow the usage which is the absolute rule with other prepositional infinitive constructions. The order with prepositional infinitives in Old French was invariably: preposition, tonic form of obj. pronoun, infinitive.

e. g. Qu'a lui servir ai mon tens si usé

(*Charr. de Nymes*, v. 427).

Qu'ele daignast a moi touchier

(Gautier d'Arras, *Eracle*, ed. Löseth, v. 3777).

Car folie est de soi grever

(*Ibid.*, v. 4602).

The order in the case of the pure infinitive construction was: atonic obj. pronoun, governing verb, infinitive, as in

Li chevals porte halt le chief

Que il nel pot mie baillier

(*Gorm. et Isemb.*, v. 311-312).

Il la fist seeler a force et a vertut

(*Pèl. Charl.*, v. 200).

These two types remained, as far as the pronoun usage was concerned, well into the 17th century for the pure infinitive, and into the 14th and 15th in the case of the prepositional.¹ *Prendre a* and *comencier a* were employed as though the *a* were not there.

I have sought to find the origin of this use of *prendre*, in the sense of "to begin" before a complementary infinitive. As far as I have observed neither *cipio* nor *prehendo* has ever had such a meaning in Classical Latin. The explanation, I believe, lies in the following.

The defective verb *coepi* gave *cepi* early, (oe > e). We find it spelled sometimes *cepi* and sometimes *coepi* (undoubtedly through conservatism of spelling), as in

- *cepinus* ascendere montes singulos
(*Peregrin.*, ed. Heraeus, iii, 1).
Ac sic ergo *cepinus* festinare
(*Ibid.*, x, 8).
Tunc ergo gratias ei agere *coepi*
(*Ibid.*, xv, 2).
At ubi autem *ceperit* se mane facere . . .
(*Ibid.*, xxix, 3).
Cum autem *coeperit* episcopus venire . . .
(*Ibid.*, xxv, 2).
Ceperunt primum homines mihi calumniari
(*Ps. Kallisth.*, iii, 8).

Cepi soon supplanted *coepi* almost entirely. When this happened *cepi* became isolated in the minds of the vulgar speakers. They therefore associated it with the only verb to which it could be attached, *cipio*, *capere*, *cepi*, *captus*. As this verb did not survive in Gaul, save in compounds, *prendo* < *prehendo* supplanted it in all instances, including it would seem the supposed instance now under consideration. But early Romance with its freer use of prepositions, after simple verbs as well as before nouns to express case relation, found that an *a* was needed to make *prendo* "begin" more intelligible.² As this was probably added after the order of the pronouns had become more or less fixed, *prendo a* plus the infinitive continued to be used as *prendre* plus infin. *Comencier a* would follow as an analogous construction.

Our modern English "take to doing" as far as I can ascertain is a descendant from the Old French construction.

U. T. HOLMES.

University of Missouri.

¹ I have discussed these constructions in detail in my doctoral dissertation submitted to the faculty of Harvard University, entitled, *The Order of the Unemphatic Object Pronoun in Old French*. This has not been published and I do not believe there is any immediate likelihood of its being so.

² Looked upon as expressing motion towards (?). Compare modern *se mettre à*.

CONCERNING JAMES MILL

A careless turn of phrase in Leslie Stephen's article on James Mill in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, last edition 1909, stating that Mill's contributions to periodicals between the years 1807-1813 cannot be identified, would appear to discourage an attempt to fix upon Mill the authorship of an article in the *Edinburgh Review* falling within the limits of these years. That Leslie Stephen was indulging in an ambiguous paraphrase of information provided by the second chapter of Bain's *Life of Mill* (p. 62, London, 1882), to which later in the same article he refers his reader, becomes clear from a reading of Bain. The latter positively identifies no less than fourteen of Mill's contributions to the *Edinburgh* during the years in question. I mention Leslie Stephen's oversight merely because the shadow of his name might cast doubt on what constitutes my main purpose in this note, namely: the addition of a not unimportant review to the list furnished by Bain.

The *Edinburgh* for April, 1809, carried as its fourteenth article a learned and powerfully written review of Thomas Taylor's translation of Plato (London, 1804). Among the known contributors not one, exclusive of Mill, possessed at once the requisite knowledge of Greek and detailed acquaintance with the Platonic philosophy sufficient to have written it. This general probability receives confirmation from the following particulars:

Protesting against the extravagances of the allegorical method in the hands of the Alexandrian sages, the reviewer cites Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, vol. 4, p. 70, and immediately following quotes Jacob Bryant's *Analysis of Antient Mythology*, vol. 3, p. 104. Now in Mill's *History of British India*, begun in 1806 but not published until 1818 (vol. 1, p. 379 ff., 4th edition, London, 1848), occurs a protest against the abuse of the allegorical method as employed by certain scholars to reconcile the gross inconsistencies of the Hindu theology; and to confirm his point Mill quotes Gibbon, vol. 4, p. 71, and directly following on p. 381 we meet the citation from Bryant, vol. 3, p. 104.

Few, I take it, would be likely to admit the hypothesis of plagiarism where Mill is concerned, especially in so petty a matter. A far easier supposition is that the hard-driven reviewer whose time was seriously taxed between the demands of the *History of India* and the education of his son, John, was induced to plagiarize from himself and to practice the justifiable economy of making his copy serve double duty. This is the more likely in view of Bain's statement (p. 169, *ibid.*) that such actually was Mill's habit.

I may add that a considerate reading of the 1809 article will bring out further evidence of Mill's authorship, notably the side-attack upon the excessive attention given in the then schools of

England to Classical Prosody, to the neglect of more solid learning, with which passage we may compare his son's words in the *Autobiography*, p. 14. The sprightliness and humour with which he scores his points are not so much contradictory to our picture of the man as supplementary and corrective thereof.

RONALD B. LEVINSON.

University of Chicago.

SHAKESPEARE'S "SMALL LATIN"

Ben Jonson's dictum that Shakespeare "had small Latin and less Greek" has been so often quoted that many persons, without inquiring carefully into the matter, are prone to lay undue stress upon it. Surely no one believes that Shakespeare read as widely or as carefully in the classics as did Jonson; yet we are coming to see that Shakespeare possessed a better acquaintance, at least with Latin authors, than perhaps Jonson himself realized.

In the work of a little known Latin writer, Seneca the Rhetorician, occur two passages so similar to two closely related passages in *I Henry IV* as almost to compel the belief that Shakespeare had read them. If he did not, they furnish at least a remarkable and interesting coincidence. The situation in *Controversiae*, II, v is somewhat similar to Hotspur's position in *I Henry IV* in that a man has plotted against his king. After he has killed the tyrant, the question arises whether his wife had known of his plans.

In *I Hen. IV*, II. iii. 112, Hotspur, having refused to tell Lady Percy his secret, concludes:

for I well believe
Thou wilt not utter what thou dost not know;

In Seneca, *Cont.*, II. v. 12, the husband says:

"non enim tibi indicavi nec tam magnum consilium, virilibus quoque animis grave, commisi muliebri garrulitati, quae id solum potest tacere, quod nescit."

Again, in the same scene of *I Hen. IV*, II. 40-65, Lady Percy describes the conduct of Hotspur, who has been keeping secret from her the conspiracy, and declares that his altered countenance, as well as the revelations into which sleep has betrayed him, has shown her that something is on his mind. In Seneca, *Cont.*, II. v. 20, a few lines after the quotation cited above, the husband says:

"nihil ego isti narraveram; ista, ut erat necesse, aliquid ex vultu, aliquid ex nocturnis vigiliis suspicata est."

May not this be at least the germ of the idea from which Shakespeare developed the magnificent description of Hotspur's disquietude?

Modern editors of *I Henry IV* have usually annotated Hotspur's reply by citing an old proverb, now in Ray's collection: "A woman will keep secret what she knows not." Is it not likely, however, considering the other parallel, that Shakespeare found both in Seneca?

MALCOLM L. WILDER.

Cornell University.

BERNARDIN DE SAINT-PIERRE AND CHARLOTTE BRONTË

Bernardin de Saint-Pierre's influence on the writers of the French Romantic school has been freely acknowledged by them and by contemporary and later critics. *Paul et Virginie* first introduced the picturesque vocabulary to French literature, and may be said to have given it a new direction, as well as color. Sainte-Beuve expresses it concisely. According to him, Chateaubriand is the father of Romanticism, Jean-Jacques the grandfather, and Bernardin de Saint-Pierre the rich uncle from India. Specially to be noted in B. de Saint-Pierre are his richness of color vocabulary, his use of the picturesque metaphor, the exquisite mixture of color and form in his cloudscapes. His was the pinceau of the Romantics.

He had also his very devoted admirers outside of France, and at least one English writer was greatly in his debt. In 1849, Charlotte Brontë makes one of the characters in *Shirley* say, "Here are the posthumous works of B. de Saint-Pierre. Read a few pages of the '*Fragments de l'Amazone*.'" And a little later, "My newly bound St.-Pierre would be soon like my Racine." Specially high praise from Brontë who knew her Racine by heart. And then, after these specific acknowledgments, comes a description as much B. de Saint-Pierre as if he had written it himself.

"A calm day had settled into a crystalline evening: the world wore a North Pole coloring: all its lights and tints looked like the 'reflets' of white, or violet or pale green gems. The hills wore a lilac blue: the setting sun had purple in its red, the sky was blue, all silvered azure: when the stars rose, they were of white crystal—not gold: gray or cerulean or faint emerald hues, cool, pure and transparent—tinged the mass of the landscape."

No one who has read Bernardin de Saint-Pierre could fail to recognize him in every adjective and simile.

There is an even more striking passage in *The Professor*, published about 1847. The tone and coloring of this novel is very quiet, even drab, and there is no attempt to make it other than a restrained and colorless recital. The same story is expanded and

brightened in *Villette*, but there is only one touch of color in *The Professor*, and this again is a passage that could have been written only by the French writer or by someone greatly influenced by him.

"Already the pavement was drying: a balmy and fresh breeze stirred the air, purified by lightning: I felt the west behind me, where spread a sky like purple, azure intermingled with crimson: the enlarged sun, glorious in Tyrian dyes, dipped his brim already: stepping, as I was, eastward, I faced a vast bank of clouds, but also I had before me the arch of an even rainbow: a perfect rainbow, high, wide, vivid.—I at last fell asleep, and then in a dream was reproduced the setting sun, the bank of clouds, the mighty rainbow. I stood, methought, on a terrace: I leaned over a parapeted wall: there was space below me, depth I could not fathom, but hearing an endless splash of waves, I believed it to be the sea: sea spread to the horizon: sea of changeful green and intense blue: all was soft in the distance, all vapor-veiled. A spark of gold glistened on the line between air and water, floated up, appeared, enlarged, changed: the object hung midway between heaven and earth, under the arch of the rainbow: the soft but dark clouds diffused behind. It hovered as on wings; pearly, fleecy gleaming air streamed like raiment around it: light, tinted with carnation, colored what seemed face and limbs: a large star shone with still luster on an angel's forehead." The whole passage a vivid reproduction of half a dozen cloudscapes of Bernardin de Saint-Pierre.

The concluding page of *Villette* is too long to be quoted, but it is recommended to those who know the French writer and to every reader who loves restraint and pure beauty in nature description.

JNO. N. WARE.

Shorter College.

BRIEF MENTION

Die Entwicklung des k-Suffixes in den indogermanischen Sprachen. Von Ferdinand Ewald (Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1924). This short treatise offers a fairly complete collection of words formed with the suffix *k* in the Indo-European languages. After a brief discussion of the meaning and origin of suffixes in general, the author comments briefly upon the original adverbial nature of the particle *-k-* (cf. Greek ἐ-κεῖ; Latin *illī-c*, *sī-c*, *nūn-c*, *ce-do*; Goth. *hi-mma* etc.). Out of these adverbial formations arose with the addition of inflectional endings adjectives (cf. Lat. *reciprocus* from **re-ke-proke*). Next the author takes up the *k*-suffix in substantives and adjectives, arranging his material according to the nature of the stems that

are expanded by this suffix (e. g. Sanskr. *dātrī*, Lat. *datrīx*; Lat. *novus*—*novi-c-ius*; Sanskr. *madhu*—*madhū-k-am*). In two short appendices are discussed the Lat. suffixes *-clom*, *-culum*, *-crum* and substantives in *-āgo*, *īgo*, *-ūgo*.

Apart from its valuable collection of material, the work is sound and treats in a clear and concise way, that could easily serve as a model for subsequent articles on other suffixes, an important chapter in Indo-Germanic word-formation.

E. H. S.

An Outline History of French Literature, by H. Stanley Schwarz, Ph.D. New York, A. A. Knopf, 1924. 163 pages. In the main, the plan is well carried out. Still it needs severe revision in many details. A book ought not to be given as reference to young students which is not personally known to the author. From the selections often made, and from the way they are arranged, we are forced to conclude that the author has been neglectful of the precaution. E. g., the *Renard* by Foulet, and that by Paulin Paris are two books so different in purpose that they do not belong on the same list,—one a scholarly study of the poems, the other an adaptation of the stories for children. J. Lemaitre's *Rousseau* must wonder why it stands next to Mrs. Macdonald's *J.-J. Rousseau, A New Criticism*; and if any of the two above are mentioned, why ignore Irving Babbitt? In the Balzac references for reading, one finds again studies of entirely different types, as the novelist's biography by his sister, Madame de Surville, and Lovenjoul's *Histoire des Oeuvres* which is of no use to young people. At least some sort of short comment ought to direct the reader. In no case does the author deem it worthwhile to distinguish between Gaston Paris and Paulin Paris. He mentions Pellissier's *Mouvement littéraire au XIX^{me} siècle*, and not the volume which is the continuation. What has Zola † 1902 to do in twentieth century drama with his *Naturalisme au Théâtre*, and what Sarcey who died before the twentieth century had arrived? One does not see how such an indiscriminating list as the bibliography on twentieth century poetry (p. 153) can do anything but confuse the minds of the students. There is at times an appearance of thoroughness which ought rather to be avoided: e. g., why give the two editions of Victor Hugo's *Odes et Ballades* of 1822 and 1826? . . . or then why omit the first edition of the *Odes* in 1818? We would have much preferred for young students to see mentioned, under 'Bibliography of Eighteenth Century Poetry,' instead of Bertrand's *Latin du Classicisme* . . ., M. Allem's *An-*

thologie . . . avec introductions, notices et notes. A regrettable slip is found on p. 78 when the French XVIIIth century is given as under the influence of Schiller, Herder and Kant. . . .

The above mentioned inaccuracies,—and *many* others,—ought to be eradicated. The task is not an easy one to prepare a book of this kind; but then, why, if one undertakes it, not have some specialist check the various chapters?

A. S.

The Two Dated Sonnets of Shakespeare. By J. A. Fort (Oxford Univ. Press, American Branch, New York, 1924; pp. 47; \$1.00). This little monograph begins by sketching the lives of Shakespeare and his patron Southampton, in order to give, in brief, the history of their friendship. Mr. Fort accepts the identification of Southampton with the "fair youth" to whom the first series of sonnets are addressed, and uses this identification as a basis for further argument. The two dated sonnets are Nos. 104 and 107. The former Mr. Fort dates at March or April, 1596 (p. 22); the latter, at November, 1598 (pp. 31 ff.). Proceeding from these fixed points, the author constructs a chronology for the sonnet series. He dates No. 1 at May, 1593, No. 126 at January or February, 1601. He now takes up the question of the authenticity of Thorpe's text, and concludes (pp. 38 ff.): "William Hall [Thorpe's Mr. W. H.], a bookseller's assistant, . . . brought copies of both series of Shakespeare's sonnets to Thorpe for publication. . . . I hold that in 1609 . . . either Southampton himself or a close friend of his, who had permission to act, secured [through Hall] the publication of these delightful poems." If so, it follows that the order of the sonnets, as Thorpe printed them, is authoritative. Mr. Fort's monograph concludes here, but he has added three appendices, the last of which is entitled "A speculation concerning the 'Dark Lady' sonnets." The title "speculation" might be applied to the whole monograph, since the evidence on which Mr. Fort's theories are built up is of the slightest, but the study is certainly an ingenious one, and gives every evidence of intimate acquaintance with the sonnets themselves—and after all, that is the best basis for any kind of scholarly activity.

K. M.